arXiv:1512.04389v3 [math.CT] 20 Jun 2016

SEMI-GALOIS CATEGORIES: THE CLASSICAL EILENBERG VARIETY THEORY

TAKEO URAMOTO

Abstract. This paper introduces and studies the class of *semi-galois categories*, i.e. an extension of galois categories, in order to develop a transparent duality-based framework for the classical Eilenberg variety theory. For this purpose, the current paper is committed to building some fundamental components of our intended framework, namely, (I) a duality theorem between profinite monoids and semi-galois categories, our proof of which is a natural extension of an elementary proof of the duality theorem between profinite groups and galois categories; and, (II) new proofs of the variety theorems of Straubing [23] and Chaubard et al. [8] based on the duality theorem between Boolean comonoids (= bialgebras over $\mathbb{F}_2$ [19]), profinite monoids and semi-galois categories. In the last section, we also discuss a role of this reformulation of the Eilenberg variety theory for solving classical problems in this theory.

1. Introduction

This paper introduces and studies the class of *semi-galois categories* (cf. §3)— an extension of *galois categories* [12]— in connection with the recent research line [11, 19, 3, 2] on *Eilenberg's variety theory* [10], i.e. an algebraic theory concerning a systematic classification of regular languages, finite monoids, and deterministic finite automata (DFAs) (cf. e.g. [13]). Briefly speaking, while galois categories are categories that are dual to profinite groups in a certain categorical sense, semi-galois categories are defined so that they become dual to profinite monoids. The primary purpose of our study on semi-galois categories is to (I) provide a transparent duality-based framework for the classical Eilenberg variety theory; and by that, (II) develop a renewed approach to classical problems in this theory (cf. §5). For this purpose, the current paper is committed to providing particularly fundamental components of our intended framework for Eilenberg's variety theory; and some example cases are studied in order to sketch a role of this reformulation.

To be more specific, we are concerned with giving a certain revised formulation of *Eilenberg's variety theorem*, that is, a central theorem in the variety theory which was originally formulated as an isomorphism between the lattice $\mathfrak{R}$ of varieties of regular languages and the lattice $\mathfrak{M}$ of pseudo-varieties of finite monoids. This theorem was first proved in 1975 by Eilenberg [10], and historically speaking, played a fundamental role in revealing a general principle behind the phenomena that some combinatorial properties of regular languages (e.g. *star-freeness* [22]) can be characterized by algebraic properties of their syntactic monoids (resp. *aperiodicity*). In fact, combining with Reiterman's theorem [17], the property that a given class $\mathcal{V}$ of regular languages forms a variety in the sense of Eilenberg provided a necessary and sufficient condition of when the membership in the class $\mathcal{V}$ is

characterized by the satisfiability of some pseudo-identities in syntactic monoids of regular languages.

Technically speaking, however, the actual challenge in this theory is not to prove the variety theorem itself, but in fact, to specify concrerely which variety of one type corresponds to a give variety of the other type under the isomorphism $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M}$ that the variety theorem indicates. Our purpose in developing yet another formulation of the classical Eilenberg variety theory essentially concerns this problem in particular. Informally speaking, the framework that we develop below can be characterized by two points that: (I) we study, in place of (pseudo-) varieties, certain algebraic structures that are of independent interest in their own right, but correspond bijectively to the original (pseudo-) varieties in a certain precise sense of lattice isomorphisms (cf. §4); these lattice isomorphisms play a role in reducing the above mentioned problem in this theory (i.e. to specify correspondences between individual varieties) into the problem on the dualities between the algebraic structures that we use in this framework (see §5); (II) moreover, the current work provides a coherent framework which concerns not only varieties of (i) regular languages and (ii) finite monoids, but also those of (iii) DFAs [8] (cf. §2), while the other existing frameworks focussed on varieties of regular languages and finite monoids.

To be more precise, we formulate Eilenberg's variety theory based on the duality theorems between three categories of algebraic structures, i.e. (i) the category **BiAlg** of *bialgebras* [1] over the two-element field $\mathbb{F}_2$; (ii) the category **Prof**.**Mon** of profinite monoids; and (iii) the category **Semi-Galois** of semi-galois categories. The duality $\mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}} \simeq \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon}$ is given by Rhodes and Steinberg (Theorem 8.4.10, [19]); and their characterization of varieties of regular languages based on bialgebras over $\mathbb{F}_2$ plays a fundamental role in this paper. Our proof of the duality $\mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon} \simeq \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$ is sketched in §3, and fully given in Appendix because it seems that there is no available paper proving this duality in the form that we need[1]. Based on these duality theorems, our reformulation of the variety theory is given in §4; as an examination of our framework, §5 gives a characterization of those semi-galois categories whose *fundamental monoids* (§3.2) are $\mathcal{L}$-trivial.

Related work. The works of Gehrke et al. [11], Adamek et al. [3, 2] and Chen et al. [9] are particularly related to the current work. In 2008 Gehrke et al. [11] redeveloped the

[1]It should be noted that in his online slide [5] in 2013, it seems that Alain Bruguières discussed a unification of Tannaka duality and Grothendieck duality; and importantly, a dual form of his claim can be used to prove a central part of our duality theorem between profinite monoids and semi-galois categories, as he briefly mentioned in his slide. In this sense, his unpublished work also should be recognized here. According to him [6], however, his preprint on this subject is not yet completed for the present; thus, rigorously speaking, we cannot completely rely on, and utilize, his claim for proving our target duality theorem. Also, since our major concern is not with unifying several duality theorems as discussed in [5] but with understanding the structure of profinite monoids themselves, it is not natural for us to give a proof of the duality theorem between profinite monoids and semi-galois categories via a more abstract consideration of monads as discussed in [5]. For these reasons, we will provide directly an elementaly proof of the duality theorem between profinite monoids and semi-galois categories, which is presented in the appendix and would be valuable in its own right for those who are particularly concerned with profinite monoids. Our proof follows the line of an elementary proof of the classical duality theorem between profinite groups and galois categories given in Tonini's note [25] in particular.

variety theorem proved by Pin [14] in the light of the Priestley duality theorem [16]. This work promoted the later works on several reformulation and generalization of Eilenberg-type theorems, including the current work and the work of Adamek et al. [3, 2] and Chen et al. [9]. To the best of our knowledge, Adamek et al. [3, 2] and Chen et al. [9] is the first who succeeded in unifying and generalizing several variants of Eilenberg-type theorems (e.g. [14, 15, 18]) within a single categorical framework. Bojańczyk's work [4] also deserves to be mentioned, which gave a generalization of the notion of recognizable languages for monads. This direction of research is being actively developed by them and will provide a general category-theoretic formulation of Eilenberg-type variety theory.

The current work is, however, distinguished from this research line by two points. First, compared to the framework developed in [3, 2, 9, 4], the current work is based on a technically different framework that is optimized for the classical Eilenberg variety theory. Our framework is designed so that the mutual correspondences between (varieties of) not only regular languages, finite monoids, but also DFAs can be reinterpreted coherently in the light of algebraic duality theorems. Since the existing related works mentioned so far focussed on regular languages and finite monoids, the fact that we naturaly include DFAs in our framework characterizes the current work. Second, the current work is not aimed at generalizing Eilenberg's variety theory. As briefly mentioned above, our reformulation of the Eilenberg variety theory is particularly aimed to develop a systematic approach to classical problems in this theory; and also, to relate precisely the Eilenberg theory with Grothendieck's galois theory that is based on the framework of galois categories [12]. (In the present paper, we focus only on the Eilenberg variety theory to separate the subject.) As the recent developments [3, 2, 9, 4] indicate, the categorical setting is now growing to be a standard setting for generalized Eilenberg-type variety theory. This fact promotes us to study how such a categorical setting is applicable to actual problems in this theory (i.e. to determine correspondences between individual varieties); the major concern of the current paper is with this issue in particular. Semi-galois categories are introduced in this relation, which serve as intermediate structure connecting regular languages and (pro-) finite monoids (cf. §6); and in the current paper, studied are their fundamental properties related to the classical Eilenberg variety theory. Finally, this paper is written as an extended version of the previous note [26]; and the first piece of this research line will appear in [27].

Acknowledgement. The current author is grateful to Naohiko Hoshino and Shin-ya Katsumata for their comments and suggestions, which improved the original presentation and simplified some proofs of the results below.

General notations. Througout this paper, alphabets are assumed to be finite and non-empty. In what follows, capital Romans $A, B, C, \cdots$ are typically used to denote alphabets. Given an alphabet A, we denote by A^* the free monoid over A; and $\varepsilon \in A^*$ denotes the empty word. Free monoids are always those over finite alphabets; by **Free**.**Mon** we denote the category of all free monoids and homomorphisms. By symbols $\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}', \cdots$ we shall denote those subcategories of **Free**.**Mon** which have all free monoids as objects. (We call such subcategories as *full-object* subcategories.) If a homomorphism $f : A^* \to B^*$ belongs

to some $\mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbf{Free}.\mathbf{Mon}$, we denote this fact by $f \in \mathbf{C}$ in symbol. From now on, we fix one of $\mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbf{Free}.\mathbf{Mon}$.

2. The Classical Variety Theorems

The goal of this paper is to give a duality-based framework of Eilenberg's variety theory. For this purpose, we start from reviewing *Straubing's variety theorem* [23], which is a variety theorem that subsumes the original Eilenberg variety theorem in a certain precise sense. (See Remark 1 below for a reason of this specific choice of our starting point instead of the original Eilenberg variety theorem.) In this section we quickly recall necessary notions concerning Straubing's theorem for the sake of reader's convenience; our main contribution starts from the next section.

Straubing's theorem can be characterized by the fact that it is based on the notions of $\mathbf{C}$-*varieties* of regular languages and those of *finite stamps* (= finite monoids with fixed generators); and claims a bijective correspondence between them.

Definition 1 ($\mathbf{C}$-varieties of regular languages)**.** A class $\mathcal{V}$ of regular languages is called a $\mathbf{C}$-*variety of regular languages* if, denoting $\mathcal{V}_A := \{L \subseteq A^* \mid L \in \mathcal{V}\}$, the following properties hold:

R1): $\emptyset \in \mathcal{V}_A$ and $A^* \in \mathcal{V}_A$ for every alphabet A;
R2): if $L, R \in \mathcal{V}_A$, then $L \cup R, L \cap R$ and $A^* \backslash L \in \mathcal{V}_A$;
R3): if $L \in \mathcal{V}_A$ and $w \in A^*$, then $w^{-1}L$ and $Lw^{-1} \in \mathcal{V}_A$;
R4): if $L \in \mathcal{V}_B$ and $f : A^* \to B^* \in \mathbf{C}$, then $f^{-1}L \in \mathcal{V}_A$.

Here, for a language $L \subseteq A^*$ and a word $w \in A^*$, we denote by $w^{-1}L \subseteq A^*$ the language $\{u \in A^* \mid wu \in L\}$ and call it the *left quotient of L by w*. The language $Lw^{-1} \subseteq A^*$ is defined similarly and called the *right quotient of L by w*. The original varieties of regular languages in Eilenberg's sense are exactly $\mathbf{C}$-varieties of regular languages with $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Free}.\mathbf{Mon}$ in particular. In this sense, the notion of $\mathbf{C}$-varieties of regular languages subsumes the original varieties.

On the other, *finite stamps* are essentially finite monoids with fixed generators. Formally, they are defined as follows.

Definition 2 (Finite stamps)**.** A *finite stamp* over an alphabet A is a surjective homomorphism $s : A^* \twoheadrightarrow M$ onto a finite monoid M.

A $\mathbf{C}$-*variety of finite stamps* is defined as a class of finite stamps that is closed under taking *products* and $\mathbf{C}$-*divisions*. To be more precise, given two finite stamps $s : A^* \twoheadrightarrow M$ and $t : A^* \twoheadrightarrow N$ over the same alphabet A, the *product* of s and t is defined as $u : A^* \twoheadrightarrow U$, where U is the image of the pairing homomorphism $\langle s, t\rangle : A^* \to M \times N$ and u is the canonical factor of $\langle s, t\rangle$ through U. We denote by $s * t$ the product of s and t. Also, we say that a finite stamp $s : A^* \twoheadrightarrow M$ $\mathbf{C}$-*divides* a finite stamp $t : B^* \twoheadrightarrow N$ if there is a pair $\langle f, \lambda\rangle$ of (I) a homomorphism $f : A^* \to B^*$ in $\mathbf{C}$; and (II) a *division* $\lambda : M \preceq N$ (that is, a surjective homomorphism $\lambda : N' \twoheadrightarrow M$ onto M from a submonoid $N' \leq N$) such that $s = \lambda \circ t \circ f$. Finally, we denote by $1_A : A^* \twoheadrightarrow 1$ the stamp to the trivial singleton monoid 1.

Definition 3 (**C**-varieties of finite stamps)**.** A class $\mathbf{V}$ of finite stamps is called a **C**-*variety of finite stamps* if, denoting $\mathbf{V}_A := \{s : A^* \twoheadrightarrow M \mid s \in \mathbf{V}\}$, the following properties hold:

M1): $1_A : A^* \twoheadrightarrow 1$ is in $\mathbf{V}_A$ for every alphabet A;
M2): if $s : A^* \twoheadrightarrow M \in \mathbf{V}_A$ and $t : A^* \twoheadrightarrow N \in \mathbf{V}_A$, then $s * t \in \mathbf{V}_A$;
M3): if $t : B^* \twoheadrightarrow N \in \mathbf{V}_B$ and $s : A^* \twoheadrightarrow M$ **C**-divides t, then $s \in \mathbf{V}_A$.

It is known [23] that there is a canonical bijective correspondence between pseudo-varieties of finite monoids in the sense of Eilenberg [10] and **Free**.**Mon**-varieties of finite stamps. In this sense, **C**-varieties of finite stamps subsume pseudo-varieties of finite monoids, as in the case of **C**-varieties of regular languages.

Concerning the notions of **C**-varieties, a remark is in order:

Remark 1. As is formally stated below, Straubing's theorem claims that there is a canonical isomorphism of (i) the lattice $\mathfrak{R}$ of **C**-varieties of regular languages and (ii) the lattice $\mathfrak{M}$ of **C**-varieties of finite stamps. In the case of $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Free}.\mathbf{Mon}$, this isomorphism $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M}$ implies the original Eilenberg variety theorem in particular; hence, Straubing's theorem subsumes Eilenberg's theorem in this sense.

There are two technical reasons for preferring Straubing's theorem as our starting point. Firstly, the original Eilenberg variety theorem can not be proved naturally from the duality theorem of Rhodes et al. [19], while so is Straubing's theorem (cf. §4); this is simply because the original definition of varieties of regular languages and that of pseudo-varieties of finite monoids are not symmetric. (**C**-varieties overcome this problem.) Second, Straubing's theorem can be extended and one obtains a similar variety theorem for **C**-varieties of *finite actions* [8] (= finite *semi-automata* in [7] which are DFAs with no fixed initial and final states); this extension was done by Chaubard, Pin and Straubing [8] in their study on wreath products of **C**-varieties of finite stamps. Since in the classical Eilenberg variety theory the classification of DFAs is also a central subject, it is fundamental to take into consideration the theorem of Chaubard et al. [8] as well as Straubing's theorem: starting from Straubing's theorem makes it easier to do so.

For this reason, our framework involves also the variety theorem of Chaubard et al. for **C**-varieties of finite actions; this theorem will be proved in §4 using a duality theorem that we study in §3. Formally, *finite actions* are defined as finite sets equipped with actions of free monoids. That is:

Definition 4 (Finite actions)**.** A *finite action* over an alphabet A is a map $\delta : A^* \times S \to S$ such that S is a finite set; and for every $u, v \in A^*$ and $\xi \in S$, we have $\delta(u, \delta(v, \xi)) = \delta(uv, \xi)$ and $\delta(\varepsilon, \xi) = \xi$.

Essentially, finite actions are the same notion as DFAs with no fixed initial and final states. For this reason, we usually identify finite actions with DFAs. Thus, for each finite action $\delta : A^* \times S \to S$, we call elements $\xi \in S$ as *states* of S; and δ the *transition function*.

A **C**-*variety of finite actions* is defined as a class of finite actions that is closed under taking *products* and **C**-*divisions* of finite actions. Precisely, given two finite actions $\delta : A^* \times S \to S$ and $\tau : A^* \times T \to T$ over the same alphabet A, the *product* of δ and τ is the finite action whose set of states is $S \times T$; and the transition function is given by $A^* \times S \times T \ni (u, \xi, \eta) \mapsto (\delta(u, \xi), \tau(u, \eta)) \in S \times T$. We denote this finite action by $\delta \times \tau$.

Also, a finite action $\delta : A^* \times S \to S$ is said to **C**-*divide* a finite action $\tau : B^* \times T \to T$ if there is a pair $\langle f, \lambda \rangle$ of (I) a homomorphism $f : A^* \to B^*$ in **C**; and (II) a partial surjection $\lambda : T \to S$ such that, for each $\xi \in \mathrm{Dom}(\lambda)$— the domain of λ— and each $u \in A^*$, we have $\tau(u, \lambda(\xi)) = \delta(f(u), \xi)$. Finally, we say that a finite action $\delta : A^* \times S \to S$ is *trivial* if $\delta(u, \xi) = \xi$ for every $u \in A^*$ and $\xi \in S$.

Definition 5 (**C**-varieties of finite actions)**.** A class $\mathscr{V}$ of finite actions is called a **C**-*variety of finite actions* if, denoting $\mathscr{V}_A := \{\delta : A^* \times S \to S \mid \delta \in \mathscr{V}\}$, the following properties hold:

D1): all trivial finite actions are in $\mathscr{V}$;
D2): if $\delta : A^* \times S \to S \in \mathscr{V}_A$ and $\tau : A^* \times T \to T \in \mathscr{V}_A$, then $\delta \times \tau \in \mathscr{V}_A$;
D3): if $\tau : B^* \times T \to T \in \mathscr{V}_B$ and $\delta : A^* \times S \to S$ **C**-divides τ, then $\delta \in \mathscr{V}_A$.

Now, the variety theorems of Straubing [23] and Chaubard et al. [8] can be stated as follows: Let $\mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{D}$ denote the lattices consisting of (i) **C**-varieties of regular languages; (ii) those of finite stamps; and (iii) those of finite actions respectively, where the order is given by the inclusion among **C**-varieties. Then:

Theorem 1 (Straubing, [23]; Chaubard, Pin, Straubing, [8])**.** *There are canonical isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$ of lattices.*

For the original proofs, see [23] and [8]. The goal of this paper is to give another duality-based formulation and proof of this theorem (cf. §4).

3. Semi-galois Categories and Fundamental Monoids

The central concept in our framework for the classical Eilenberg variety theory is the notions of *semi-galois categories* (§3.1) and their *fundamental monoids* (§3.2). Informally speaking, on the one hand, semi-galois categories are categories that axiomatize those of finite sets equipped with continuous actions of profinite monoids; on the other hand, the fundamental monoid $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ of a semi-galois category $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ serves an algebraic invariant that completely characterizes the semi-galois category $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ up to categorical equivalence. Precisely, if two semi-galois categories, say $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ and $\langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}' \rangle$, have isomorphic fundamental monoids (i.e. $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}) \simeq \pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}')$), then they are in fact equivalent as semi-galois categories $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle \simeq \langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}' \rangle$. This is simply a consequence of a duality theorem between profinite monoids and semi-galois categories under the construction $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle \mapsto \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ of fundamental monoids (cf. §3.3).

As far as our intended formulation of the classical variety theorem (i.e. Theorem 1) is concerned, these concepts are used to reinterpret the calculation of the **C**-variety of finite stamps that corresponds to a given **C**-variety of finite actions (or regular languages) under the isomorphism $\mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$ (or $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M}$) as the calculation of the fundamental monoid $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ of a given semi-galois category $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$. From a practical standpoint, this abstract reinterpretation plays the same role as the abstract semigroup theory does for the study on transformation semigroups.

A formal statement of this reinterpretation is given in the next section (§4); and some examples of the relationship between semi-galois categories and fundamental monoids are discussed in §5. The proofs for the results in this section are given in Appendix.

3.1. **Semi-galois categories.** Now we define semi-galois categories and give some key examples. In what follows, let $\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ denote the category of finite sets and maps; $\emptyset$ denote the empty set and 1 the singleton $\{*\}$.

Definition 6. A *semi-galois category* is a pair $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ of an essentially small category $\mathscr{C}$ and a functor $\mathrm{F} : \mathscr{C} \to \mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ satisfying the following axioms:

- C_0)**:** $\mathscr{C}$ has the initial object $\emptyset$ and the final object 1;
- C_1)**:** $\mathscr{C}$ has finite pullbacks and finite pushouts;
- C_2)**:** every arrow $f : X \to Y$ in $\mathscr{C}$ factors as $f = \pi_f j_f$ such that $\pi_f : X \twoheadrightarrow Z$ is an epimorphism, and $j_f : Z \hookrightarrow Y$ is a monomorphism;
- F_0)**:** $\mathrm{F}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ and $\mathrm{F}(1) = 1$;
- F_1)**:** F preserves finite pullbacks and finite pushouts;
- F_2)**:** F reflects isomorphisms.

Here, the composition of arrows $f : X \to Y, g : Y \to Z$ in semi-galois categories is denoted $fg : X \to Z$, rather than $g \circ f$. The corresponding map $\mathrm{F}(f)$ in $\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ is denoted simply by $f_* : \mathrm{F}(X) \to \mathrm{F}(Y)$, and its action on elements $\xi \in \mathrm{F}(X)$ is denoted $\xi f_* \in \mathrm{F}(X)$. For notational reason, however, natural transformations $\phi : \mathrm{F} \Rightarrow \mathrm{F}$ act from the left on each element $\xi \in \mathrm{F}(X)$ at each object $X \in \mathscr{C}$. So, we denote by $\phi_X(\xi) \in \mathrm{F}(X)$ the action of a natural transformation $\phi : \mathrm{F} \Rightarrow \mathrm{F}$ on $\xi \in \mathrm{F}(X)$ at $X \in \mathscr{C}$; the composition of $\phi, \psi : \mathrm{F} \Rightarrow \mathrm{F}$ (first ϕ; second ψ) is written as $\psi \circ \phi$. The functor F is called a *fiber functor* of $\mathscr{C}$.

Example 1. Let M be a profinite monoid; the category of *finite left M-sets* and *M-equivariant maps* forms a semi-galois category, and provides a proto-typical example of semi-galois categories.

Precisely, a *finite left M-set* is defined as a continuous map $\rho : M \times S \to S$ such that S is a finite set equipped with the discrete topology; and for every $m, n \in M$ and $\xi \in S$, we have $\rho(m, \rho(n, \xi)) = \rho(mn, \xi)$ and $\rho(1, \xi) = \xi$ with $1 \in M$ the identity of M. Usually, we write $\rho(m, \xi) = m \cdot \xi$. Also, for finite left M-sets $\rho : M \times S \to S$ and $\tau : M \times T \to T$, an *M-equivariant map* $f : \rho \to \tau$ is a map $f_* : S \to T$ such that $(m \cdot \xi) f_* = m \cdot (\xi f_*)$ for every $\xi \in S$ and $m \in M$. The category M-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ is defined as the one whose objects are finite left M-sets and arrows are M-equivariant maps. Also, let $\mathrm{F}_M : M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega \to \mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ be the forgetful functor. Then, the pair $\langle M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M \rangle$ is a semi-galois category.

Example 2. Let A be an alphabet; the category of *deterministic finite automata* (DFAs) over A and *transition-preserving maps* forms a semi-galois category of our special concern (cf. §4).

Precisely, a *DFA* over A is defined here as a pair $\langle S, \delta \rangle$ of a finite set S and a map $\delta : A \times S \to S$. Elements of S are called *states* of the DFA; while δ is called its *transition function*— we also refer to the transition function $\delta : A \times S \to S$ itself as a DFA. The transition function δ is canonically extended onto (and identified with) a finite action $\bar{\delta} : A^* \times S \to S$ over A by induction on the length of words $w \in A^*$. That is, $\bar{\delta}(\varepsilon, \xi) := \xi$ and $\bar{\delta}(wa, \xi) := \bar{\delta}(w, \delta(a, \xi))$ for every $a \in A$, $w \in A^*$ and $\xi \in S$. In what follows, the extended map $\bar{\delta}$ is also denoted $\delta : A^* \times S \to S$; and we write $w \cdot \xi := \delta(w, \xi)$. A *transition-preserving map* f from a DFA $\langle S, \delta \rangle$ to a DFA $\langle T, \tau \rangle$ is a map $f_* : S \to T$ such that $(w \cdot \xi) f_* = w \cdot (\xi f_*)$ for every $w \in A^*$ and $\xi \in S$.

The category A-**DFA** is defined as the one whose objects are DFAs over A and arrows are transition-preserving maps; denoting by $\mathrm{F}_A : A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA} \to \mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ the forgetful functor, then the pair $\langle A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_A\rangle$ forms a semi-galois category. Now let $\hat{A}^*$ be the free profinite monoid over A. By the density of A^* in $\widehat{A^*}$, the semi-galois category $\langle A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_A\rangle$ is equivalent to $\langle \hat{A}^*\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_{\hat{A}^*}\rangle$; in this sense, $\langle A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_A\rangle$ is the simplest example of semi-galois categories.

3.2. **Fundamental monoids.** There are at least two (isomorphic) ways to construct the fundamental monoid $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ of a semi-galois category $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle$. The simplest way is to construct it as the monoid $\mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$ of natural endomorphisms $\mathrm{F} \Rightarrow \mathrm{F}$ on the fiber functor F. However, for a practical reason (cf. Remark 3), we prefer to construct fundamental monoids $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ using certain objects which we call *galois objects* in $\mathscr{C}$. To define the notion and to give the construction, we need several concepts, including *coverings* and *rooted objects*. In what follows, we denote by $\mathrm{Hom}(X, Y)$ the set of arrows from $X \in \mathscr{C}$ to $Y \in \mathscr{C}$; and $\mathrm{End}(X) := \mathrm{Hom}(X, X)$. Coproducts are denoted as $\coprod_i Y_i$.

Definition 7 (Covering)**.** A *covering* of an object Y is a finite family $\{\iota_i : Y_i \hookrightarrow Y\}_{i=1}^n$ of monomorphisms $\iota_i : Y_i \hookrightarrow Y$ $(1 \leq i \leq n)$ such that the induced morphism $\coprod_i \iota_i : \coprod_i Y_i \to Y$ is an epimorphism.

Definition 8 (Rooted object)**.** An object $X \in \mathscr{C}$ is called a *rooted object* if, for every object $Y \in \mathscr{C}$; an arrow $f : X \to Y$; and a covering $\{\iota_i : Y_i \hookrightarrow Y\}_{i=1}^n$ of Y, the arrow f factors through some component $\iota_k : Y_k \hookrightarrow Y$ of the covering: That is, there is an arrow $f_k : X \to Y_k$ such that $f = f_k \iota_k$.

Example 3. Let M be a profinite monoid. Then a finite left M-set $\rho : M \times S \to S$ is rooted in M-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ if and only if there exists $\xi \in S$ such that every $\xi' \in S$ is represented as $\xi' = m \cdot \xi$ for some $m \in M$.

Abstractly, let $X \in \mathscr{C}$ be an arbitrary object. For every two monomorphisms $X_1 \hookrightarrow X, X_2 \hookrightarrow X$ into X (i.e. *subobjects* of X), we can take the *intersection* $X_1 \cap X_2 \hookrightarrow X$ by taking pullback. Also, let $\xi \in \mathrm{F}(X)$ be an arbitrary element. Since $\mathrm{F}(X)$ is a finite set, there exists a (unique) minimal subobject $X' \hookrightarrow X$ such that $\xi \in \mathrm{F}(X')$. We write it as $X' = X_\xi$.

Proposition 1. *An object X is rooted if and only if $X = X_\xi$ for some $\xi \in \mathrm{F}(X)$.*

Let $X \in \mathscr{C}$ be rooted and assume $X = X_\xi$. Then, for any $Y \in \mathscr{C}$, the map $\mathrm{Hom}(X, Y) \ni f \mapsto \xi f_* \in \mathrm{F}(Y)$ is proved to be injective; in particular, the map $\omega_{X,\xi} : \mathrm{End}(X) \ni f \mapsto \xi f_* \in \mathrm{F}(X)$ is injective. A *galois object* in $\mathscr{C}$ is then defined as a rooted object for which the map $\omega_{X,\xi}$ becomes bijective.

Definition 9 (Galois object)**.** A pair of an object $X \in \mathscr{C}$ and $\xi \in \mathrm{F}(X)$ is said to be a *galois object* if $X = X_\xi$ and the map $\omega_{X,\xi} : \mathrm{End}(X) \ni f \mapsto \xi f_* \in \mathrm{F}(X)$ is bijective.

We also say that an object $X \in \mathscr{C}$ is a galois object if so is (X, ξ) for some $\xi \in \mathrm{F}(X)$, whence ξ is called a *root* of X.

Remark 2. When $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle$ is a galois category, the definition of galois objects given here is equivalent to the original definition of galois objects. (cf. [25]; rooted objects in galois

categories are equivalent to connected objects.) So, we shall call them 'galois' objects rather than 'semi-galois' objects.

We start with the construction of fundamental monoids using galois objects. For this purpose, several lemmas are necessary.

Lemma 1. *Let (X,ξ) and (X',ξ') be galois objects. Then there exits at most one arrow $\lambda : X \to X'$ such that $\xi\lambda_* = \xi'$; and if exists, such λ is an epimorphism.*

By this lemma, a pre-order $\leq$ on galois objects can be defined by $(X,\xi) \leq (X',\xi')$ if and only if there exists an arrow $\lambda : X' \to X$ such that $\xi'\lambda_* = \xi$. When this is the case, we write $\lambda : (X',\xi') \to (X,\xi)$. In what follows, this pre-ordered set of galois objects is denoted $\mathscr{G}$ that turns out to be *cofiltered* in the following sense.

Lemma 2. *For every two galois objects $(X,\xi),(X',\xi') \in \mathscr{G}$, there is a third galois object $(X'',\xi'') \in \mathscr{G}$ such that $(X,\xi) \leq (X'',\xi'')$ and $(X',\xi') \leq (X'',\xi'')$.*

The cofiltered pre-ordered set $\mathscr{G}$ is used as the index set of an inverse system of finite monoids whose limit is isomorphic to $\mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$ as monoids. The inverse system consists of finite monoids $\mathrm{End}(X)$, where X ranges over all galois objects $(X,\xi) \in \mathscr{G}$. More precisely, the construction of the inverse system is based on the following two lemmas:

Lemma 3. *Let (X,ξ) and (X',ξ') be galois objects with $\lambda : (X,\xi) \to (X',\xi')$. Then, for every $u \in \mathrm{End}(X)$, there exists a unique $u' \in \mathrm{End}(X')$ such that the equality $u\lambda = \lambda u'$ holds.*

Lemma 4. *Let (X,ξ) and (X',ξ') be galois objects with $\lambda : (X,\xi) \to (X',\xi')$. Then the above correspondence $\mathrm{End}(X) \ni u \mapsto u' \in \mathrm{End}(X')$ is a surjective homomorphism of finite monoids.*

For simplicity, we reserve capital Greeks $\Gamma,\Gamma'\cdots$ to name galois objects, e.g. $\Gamma = (X,\xi)$. Also, if we denote $\mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ for $\Gamma = (X,\xi) \in \mathscr{G}$, we mean $\mathrm{End}(\Gamma) := \mathrm{End}(X)$. For galois objects $\Gamma = (X,\xi)$ and $\Gamma' = (X',\xi')$ with $\Gamma' \leq \Gamma$, the induced surjective homomorphism $\mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{End}(\Gamma')$ is denoted $\rho^{\Gamma}_{\Gamma'}$.

Then this defines an inverse system $\{\mathrm{End}(\Gamma)\}_{\Gamma\in\mathscr{G}}$ of finite monoids $\mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$. The limit of the system $\{\mathrm{End}(\Gamma)\}_{\Gamma\in\mathscr{G}}$ is denoted simply $\lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$. More explicitly, $\lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ consists of families $\mathbf{u} = \{u_\Gamma\}_{\Gamma\in\mathscr{G}}$ of endomorphisms $u_\Gamma \in \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ such that $\rho^{\Gamma}_{\Gamma'}(u_\Gamma) = u_{\Gamma'}$ for all $\Gamma' \leq \Gamma \in \mathscr{G}$; the multiplication of $\mathbf{u} = \{u_\Gamma\}_{\Gamma\in\mathscr{G}}$ and $\mathbf{v} = \{v_\Gamma\}_{\Gamma\in\mathscr{G}}$ is given by:

$$\mathbf{uv} \;=\; \{u_\Gamma v_\Gamma\}_{\Gamma\in G}. \tag{1}$$

Theorem 2. *There is a canonical isomorphism of monoids:*

$$\delta : \lim_{\leftarrow\Gamma} \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F}). \tag{2}$$

To be more specific, let $\mathbf{u} = \{u_\Gamma\} \in \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$. Then, the corresponding $\delta\mathbf{u} = \{\delta\mathbf{u}_Y\} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$ can be defined as follows. Take $Y \in \mathscr{C}$ arbitrarily and let $\eta \in \mathrm{F}(Y)$; there exists an arrow $\sigma : X \to Y$ from a galois object $\Gamma = (X,\xi)$ such that $\xi\sigma_* = \eta$ (cf. Appendix). Now define $\delta\mathbf{u}_Y(\eta) \in \mathrm{F}(Y)$ by:

$$\delta\mathbf{u}_Y(\eta) \;:=\; \xi u_{\Gamma *}\sigma_*. \tag{3}$$

This does not depend on the choice of Γ and σ. Thus, we obtain maps $\delta\mathbf{u}_Y : \mathrm{F}(Y) \to \mathrm{F}(Y)$ for every $Y \in \mathscr{C}$ that in fact constitute a natural transformation $\delta\mathbf{u} = \{\delta\mathbf{u}_Y\} : \mathrm{F} \Rightarrow \mathrm{F}$.

Definition 10 (Fundamental monoid)**.** Let $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle$ be a semi-galois category. Then, the *fundamental monoid* of $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle$ is defined as the profinite monoid given by the inverse limit $\lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \simeq \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$; and is denoted $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$.

Remark 3. Here, note that while each $\phi \in \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$ is made from maps $\phi_X : \mathrm{F}(X) \to \mathrm{F}(X)$ in $\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$, the corresponding $\delta^{-1}\phi = \mathbf{u} \in \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ is made from arrows $u_\Gamma \in \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ in $\mathscr{C}$. So, for the purpose of studying the relationship between the categorical structure of $\mathscr{C}$ and the algebraic structure of $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$, we use the representation $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}) \simeq \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ rather than the representation $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}) \simeq \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$ (cf. §5).

3.3. **The duality theorem.** The construction $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle \mapsto \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ of fundamental monoids gives rise to the duality between semi-galois categories and profinite monoids in a precise categorical sense. To state this formally, we define the category **Semi-Galois** of semi-galois categories and *exact functors* (to be precise, their equivalence classes), so that **Semi-Galois** is opposite equivalent to the category **Prof**.**Mon** of profinite monoids and continuous homomorphisms.

Definition 11 (exact functor)**.** Let $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle$ and $\langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}'\rangle$ be semi-galois categories. An *exact functor* from $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle$ to $\langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}'\rangle$ is a pair $\langle A, \sigma\rangle$ of a functor $A : \mathscr{C} \to \mathscr{C}'$ and a natural isomorphism $\sigma : \mathrm{F}' \circ A \Rightarrow \mathrm{F}$ such that A preserves finite limits and colimits.

Let $\langle A, \sigma\rangle : \langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle \to \langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}'\rangle$ and $\langle A', \sigma'\rangle : \langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}'\rangle \to \langle \mathscr{C}'', \mathrm{F}''\rangle$ be exact functors. Then their composition is given by $\langle A' \circ A, \sigma \circ \sigma' A\rangle : \mathrm{F}'' \circ A' \circ A \Rightarrow \mathrm{F}' \circ A \Rightarrow \mathrm{F}$. Also, let $\langle A, \sigma\rangle, \langle B, \tau\rangle : \langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle \to \langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}'\rangle$ be parallel exact functors. Then, they are said to be *equivalent*, $\langle A, \sigma\rangle \equiv \langle B, \tau\rangle$ in symbol, if there exists a natural isomorphism $\lambda : A \Rightarrow B$ such that $\tau \circ \mathrm{F}'\lambda = \sigma$. For each exact functor $\langle A, \sigma\rangle$, we denote its equivalence class by $[A, \sigma]$.

Definition 12 (The category of semi-galois categories)**.** The category **Semi-Galois** is defined as the category whose objects are semi-galois categories $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle$; and arrows are equivalence classes $[A, \sigma]$ of exact functors. The composition of arrows is induced from that of exact functors.

The construction of fundamental monoids $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle \mapsto \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ extends to a functor $\pi_1 : \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}} \to \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon}$. To see this, let $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle, \langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}'\rangle$ be semi-galois categories and $\langle A, \sigma\rangle : \langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle \to \langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}'\rangle$ be an exact functor. Then, a map $\pi_1(A, \sigma) : \pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}') \to \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ between the fundamental monoids is defined as follows: regarding $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}) = \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}') & \xrightarrow{\pi_1(A,\sigma)} & \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}) \\ \phi & \longmapsto & \sigma \circ \phi A \circ \sigma^{-1} \end{array}$$

By this definition, it follows that if $\langle A, \sigma\rangle \equiv \langle B, \tau\rangle$, then $\pi_1(A, \sigma) = \pi_1(B, \tau)$. So, the assignment $[A, \sigma] \mapsto \pi_1(A, \sigma)$ is well-defined; and also, each $\pi_1(A, \sigma)$ is proved to be a continuous homomorphism of profinite monoids. The functor $\pi_1 : \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}} \to$

Prof.**Mon** is then defined by the assignment $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle \mapsto \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ on objects and $[A, \sigma] \mapsto \pi_1(A, \sigma)$ on arrows.

The inverse $\mathscr{R} : \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon} \to \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$ of the functor π_1 is given by the assignment $M \mapsto \langle M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M\rangle$ on objects. To extend it onto arrows, let $f : M \to M'$ be a continuous homomorphism of profinite monoids. First, a functor $\mathrm{R}(f) : M'\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega \to M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ is defined by sending a finite left M'-set $\rho : M' \times S \to S$ to the finite left M-set $\mathrm{R}(f)(\rho) := \rho \circ (f \times \mathrm{id}_S) : M \times S \to M' \times S \to S$; and an M'-equivariant map $h : \rho \to \tau$ to h itself. Clearly, the equality $\mathrm{F}_{M'} = \mathrm{F}_M \circ \mathrm{R}(f)$ holds. Since $\mathrm{R}(f)$ preserves finite limits and colimits, the pair $\langle \mathrm{R}(f), \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{F}_{M'}}\rangle$ is an exact functor from $\langle M'\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_{M'}\rangle$ to $\langle M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M\rangle$; thus, represents an arrow $\mathscr{R}(f) := [\mathrm{R}(f), \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{F}_{M'}}]$ from $\langle M'\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_{M'}\rangle$ to $\langle M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M\rangle$ in **Semi-Galois**. Consequently, the functor $\mathscr{R} : \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon} \to \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$ is given by the assignment $M \mapsto \langle M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M\rangle$ on objects; and $f \mapsto \mathscr{R}(f)$ on arrows.

Theorem 3 (The duality theorem)**.** $\pi_1 : \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}} \leftrightarrows \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon} : \mathscr{R}$ *are mutually inverse equivalences of categories.*

Remark 4. The fact that π_1 and $\mathscr{R}$ define mutually inverse equivalences of categories implies that (I) every semi-galois category $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle$ is equivalent to that of finite left $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$-sets, i.e. $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle \simeq \langle \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_{\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})}\rangle$; and (II) every profinite monoid M is isomorphic to the fundamental monoid of the semi-galois category $\langle M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M\rangle$ of finite left M-sets: i.e. $M \simeq \pi_1(M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M)$.

Example 4. In particular, for an alphabet A, the fundamental monoid of the semi-galois category $\langle A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_A\rangle$ of all DFAs over A (cf. §3.1) is isomorphic to the free profinite monoid $\hat{A}^*$: that is, $\pi_1(A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_A) \simeq \hat{A}^*$.

Remark 5. Let us say that a semi-galois category $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle$ is *embeddable* in another semi-galois category $\langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}'\rangle$ if there exists an effective monomorphism $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle \to \langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}'\rangle$ in **Semi-Galois**; in this case, $\mathscr{C}$ is equivalent to some full subcategory of $\mathscr{C}'$. The Duality Theorem 3 provides a characterization of those semi-galois categories which are embeddable in $\langle A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_A\rangle$ for some alphabet A in particular. That is, a semi-galois category $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle$ is embeddable in $\langle A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_A\rangle$ if and only if the fundamental monoid $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ is topologically generated by $|A|$ elements. This abstract characterization is used in §4 for an algebraic representation of **C**-varieties of finite actions.

Remark 6. The effective monomorphisms in **Semi-Galois** are exactly those corresponding to surjections in **Prof**.**Mon**. In fact, surjections among profinite monoids can be characterized as effective epimorphisms in **Prof**.**Mon**. In this paper subobjects in **Semi-Galois** are assumed to be effective monomorphisms since we will consider in §4 only those corresponding to surjections in **Prof**.**Mon**.

Example 5 (Relatively free profinite monoids)**.** Let $\mathcal{V} \in \mathfrak{R}$ be a **C**-variety of regular languages, and A be an alphabet. Also, let $\mathscr{C}_\mathcal{V}$ be the full subcategory of $\langle A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_A\rangle$ consisting of those DFAs that accept languages in $\mathcal{V}$ (with respect to each initial and final states). Then $\mathscr{C}_\mathcal{V}$ forms a semi-galois category, whose fiber functor is given by the restriction $\mathrm{F}_A|_{\mathscr{C}_\mathcal{V}}$ of F_A onto $\mathscr{C}_\mathcal{V}$; its fundamental monoid $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}_\mathcal{V}, \mathrm{F}_A|_{\mathscr{C}_\mathcal{V}})$ is in fact isomorphic to the relatively free profinite monoid $\overline{\Omega}_A\mathbf{V}$, where $\mathbf{V} \in \mathfrak{M}$ is the **C**-variety of finite stamps that corresponds to $\mathcal{V}$ under the isomorphism $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M}$ of Straubing's variety theorem [23].

This fact sketches an auxiliary role that the calculation of the fundamental monoids of abstract semi-galois categories plays when actually determining the $\mathbf{C}$-variety $\mathbf{V}$ of finite stamps that corresponds to a given $\mathbf{C}$-variety $\mathcal{V}$ of regular languages under the isomorphism $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M}$ (cf. §5); the next section §4 gives a formal proof of this fact.

4. The Variety Theorems, Revisited

The variety theorems of Straubing [23] and Chaubard et al. [8] are originally stated as the isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$ of the lattices of $\mathbf{C}$-varieties (Theorem 1, §2). Theoretically speaking, these variety theorems are fundamental results in the Eilenberg variety theory, because they provide a generic description of the mutual relationships between properties of regular languages, finite monoids, and DFAs. But, practically speaking, the technical challenge in this theory appears when we try to determine what $\mathbf{C}$-variety of one type corresponds to a given $\mathbf{C}$-variety of the other type under the isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$ of the variety theorems. This means that it also serves a fundamental subject in this theory to give a transparent representation of the isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$ so that it becomes easy or systematic to determine the correspondences between $\mathbf{C}$-varieties.

Our major purpose in giving yet another formulation of the variety theorems concerns this problem in particular. As seen in Example 5 above, some part of the process to determine the $\mathbf{C}$-variety $\mathbf{V} \in \mathfrak{M}$ of finite stamps that corresponds to a given $\mathbf{C}$-variety $\mathcal{V} \in \mathfrak{R}$ of regular languages is reducible to the process to determine the fundamental monoid of a given semi-galois category; importantly, the later is in the scope of abstract finite semigroup theory. In fact, in the context of semigroup theory, it is traditional [24] to deal with categories in themselves as algebraic structures; and from the viewpoint of finite semigroup theory, the class of semi-galois categories is a relatively amenable class of categories in several aspects (e.g. semi-galois categories are always *locally finite*, i.e. each Hom-set is finite; and so, each End-set is a finite monoid). In this relation, we examine in §5 characterizations of when the fundamental monoid of a given semi-galois category become $\mathcal{L}$-trivial.

The current section gives a formalization of the claim stated in Example 5. Briefly speaking, it is given as a duality-based proof of the isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$, where the idea of Rhodes et al. [19] plays a fundamental role. In the proof below, the lattices $\mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{D}$ of $\mathbf{C}$-varieties are proved isomorphic to certain lattices $\mathfrak{R}', \mathfrak{M}', \mathfrak{D}'$ consisting of suitable functors from $\mathbf{C}$ to $\mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}}, \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon}, \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$ respectively (here $\mathbf{BiAlg}$ is the category of bialgebras over $\mathbb{F}_2$). Then, the target isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$ follow from the isomorphism $\mathfrak{R}' \simeq \mathfrak{M}' \simeq \mathfrak{D}'$ that are directly proved by the duality theorems $\mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}} \simeq \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon} \simeq \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$. (The duality theorem $\mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}} \simeq \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon}$ is due to Rhodes et al., Theorem 8.4.10 [19].)

We remark that this proof is not intended to simplify the original proof of the isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$; but intended to give a specific representation of the target isomorphisms based on the duality theorems of (i) bialgebras, (ii) profinite monoids and (iii) semi-galois categories. This representation plays a role in reducing the calculation of correspondences between $\mathbf{C}$-varieties into the calculation of the dualities between (i), (ii) and (iii), i.e. the algebraic structures of interest in their own right. (See §5.) Our proof is given in a step-by-step manner (meaning the proof is a bit roundabout) in order to

make explicit where (i), (ii) and (iii) are actually used. The problem that occurs after this reformulation is briefly discussed in §5 with some simple examples.

4.1. **Local varieties.** First, to give the isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{R}', \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{M}', \mathfrak{D} \simeq \mathfrak{D}'$, we need notions called *local varieties* of regular languages, finite stamps, and finite actions. (This terminology is basically from Adamek et al. [2] and Chen et al. [9]; but further we need to define local varieties of finite actions.)

Firstly, a *local variety of regular languages* is defined by forgetting the axiom **R4** from the definition of **C**-varieties of regular languages (cf. Definition 1, §2):

Definition 13 (Local variety of regular languages)**.** A class $\mathcal{V}_A$ of regular languages over A is a *local variety of regular languages over* A if it satisfies **R1**, **R2** and **R3**.

To define *local varieties of finite stamps*, we need modify the original definition of **C**-varieties of finite stamps (cf. §2, Definition 3): Notice that a class $\mathbf{V}$ of finite stamps is a **C**-variety of finite stamps if and only if it satisfies the following four properties:

M1): $1_A : A^* \twoheadrightarrow 1$ is in $\mathbf{V}_A$ for every alphabet A;
M2): if $s : A^* \twoheadrightarrow M, t : A^* \twoheadrightarrow N \in \mathbf{V}_A$, then $s * t \in \mathbf{V}_A$;
M3'): if $s : A^* \twoheadrightarrow M \in \mathbf{V}_A$ and $h : M \twoheadrightarrow N$ is surjective, then $h \circ s \in \mathbf{V}_A$;
M4'): if $t : B^* \twoheadrightarrow N \in \mathbf{V}_B$ and $s : A^* \twoheadrightarrow M$ is such that $j \circ s = t \circ f$ where $j : M \hookrightarrow N$ is an embedding, and $f : A^* \to B^*$ is in **C**, then $s \in \mathbf{V}_A$.

That is, we can replace the original axiom **M3** by **M3′** and **M4′**. Then, the notion of *local varieties of finite stamps* is defined by forgetting **M4′**:

Definition 14 (Local variety of finite stamps)**.** A class $\mathbf{V}_A$ of finite stamps over an alphabet A is a *local variety of finite stamps over* A if it satisfies **M1**, **M2** and **M3′**.

Similarly, note that a class $\mathscr{V}$ of finite actions is a **C**-variety of finite actions if and only if it satisfies the following five properties (cf. §2, Definition 5):

D1): all trivial finite actions are in $\mathscr{V}$;
D2): if $s : A^* \times S \to S \in \mathscr{V}_A$ and $t : A^* \times T \to T \in \mathscr{V}_A$, then $s \times t \in \mathscr{V}_A$;
D3'): if $s : A^* \times S \to S \in \mathscr{V}_A$ and t is a *subaction* of s, then $t \in \mathscr{V}_A$;
D4'): if $s : A^* \times S \to S \in \mathscr{V}_A$ and t is a *quotient* of s, then $t \in \mathscr{V}_A$;
D5'): if $s : B^* \times S \to S \in \mathscr{V}_B$ and $f : A^* \to B^* \in \mathbf{C}$, then $f^*s : A^* \times S \to S \in \mathscr{V}_A$.

Here, for two finite actions $s : A^* \times S \to S$ and $t : A^* \times T \to T$ over the same alphabet A, we say that t is a *subaction* of s if $T \subseteq S$ and $u \cdot \xi \in T$ for every $\xi \in T$ and $u \in A^*$; we say that t is a *quotient* of s if there exists a surjection $\pi_* : S \twoheadrightarrow T$ such that $(u \cdot \xi)\pi_* = u \cdot (\xi\pi_*)$ for every $\xi \in S$ and $u \in A^*$; and also, for a finite action $s : B^* \times S \to S$ and a homomorphism $f : A^* \to B^*$, we denote by f^*s the finite action $s \circ (f \times \mathrm{id}_S) : A^* \times S \to B^* \times S \to S$. Then:

Definition 15 (Local variety of finite actions)**.** A class $\mathscr{V}_A$ of finite actions over A is a *local variety of finite actions over* A if it satisfies **D1**, **D2**, **D3′** and **D4′**.

4.2. **Representations of local varieties.** Let A be an alphabet. Denote by $\mathfrak{R}_A, \mathfrak{M}_A$ and $\mathfrak{D}_A$ the lattices of local varieties of regular languages, finite stamps, and finite actions over A respectively, where the order is given by the inclusion of local varieties. These lattices are

canonically isomorphic to certain lattices made from bialgebras over $\mathbb{F}_2$, profinite monoids and semi-galois categories; and using this fact, the isomorphism $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$ is proved via duality theorems.

We start with the most straightforward one, i.e. the lattice $\mathfrak{M}_A$. Let $\mathfrak{M}'_A$ be the lattice consisting of (isomorphism classes of) quotients $\pi : \hat{A}^* \twoheadrightarrow M$ of the free profinite monoid $\hat{A}^*$ in **Prof**.**Mon**. Here, two quotients $\pi : \hat{A}^* \twoheadrightarrow M, \pi' : \hat{A}^* \twoheadrightarrow M'$ are ordered $\pi \leq \pi'$ if and only if there is a surjective homomorphism $\lambda : M' \twoheadrightarrow M$ such that $\pi = \lambda \circ \pi'$. Then:

Proposition 2. *There is a canonical isomorphism $\mathfrak{M}_A \simeq \mathfrak{M}'_A$ of lattices.*

The isomorphism $\mathfrak{M}_A \to \mathfrak{M}'_A$ is given by taking inverse limits of local varieties $\mathscr{V}_A$ of finite stamps over A. (Each local variety of finite stamps $\mathscr{V}_A$ can be seen as an inverse system of finite monoids by ordering $s : A^* \twoheadrightarrow N_s \leq s' : A^* \twoheadrightarrow N_{s'}$ if and only if there exists a surjective homomorphism $\lambda : N_{s'} \twoheadrightarrow N_s$ such that $s = \lambda \circ s'$. The inverse limit of $\mathscr{V}_A$ is defined as the limit $\lim_{s \in \mathscr{V}_A} N_s$ with respect to this ordering.)

A corresponding characterization of the lattice $\mathfrak{R}_A$ was given by Rhodes et al. [19]. Here, we recall only two necessary facts from their work; for more detail, the reader is refered to §8.4, [19]. Let $\mathrm{Reg}(A)$ be the Boolean algebra of all regular languages over A. Then, they pointed out the facts that:

(1) $\mathrm{Reg}(A)$ *canonically admits a structure of bialgebra over* $\mathbb{F}_2$ (e.g. [1]); and
(2) *A class* $\mathcal{V}_A \subseteq \mathrm{Reg}(A)$ *is a local variety of regular languages over A if and only if* $\mathcal{V}_A$ *is a sub-bialgebra of* $\mathrm{Reg}(A)$.

Generally, Boolean algebras can be regarded equivalently as Boolean rings whose summation is given by the differential sum $L \oplus R := (L \backslash R) \cup (R \backslash L)$; and thus, can be regarded also as vector spaces over $\mathbb{F}_2$. The bialgebra structure of $\mathrm{Reg}(A)$ is the one with respect to this vector-space structure. The above two facts means that (1) if we denote by **BiAlg** the category of bialgebras over $\mathbb{F}_2$ and bialgebra maps, $\mathrm{Reg}(A)$ is an object of **BiAlg**; and (2) if we denote by $\mathfrak{R}'_A$ the lattice consisting of (isomorphism classes of) subobjects of $\mathrm{Reg}(A)$ in **BiAlg**, then it characterizes $\mathfrak{R}_A$. That is:

Proposition 3 (Rhodes and Steinberg, §8.4, [19])**.** *There is a canonical isomorphism $\mathfrak{R}_A \simeq \mathfrak{R}'_A$ of lattices.*

Remark 7. The bialgebra structure of $\mathrm{Reg}(A)$ of Rhodes et al. is in fact isomorphic to the *representative bialgebra* of the free monoid A^* over $\mathbb{F}_2$ in the sense of the traditional group representation theory (e.g. [1]). In view of the fact that the structure of representative bialgebras has been well studied in the context of group representation theory, the major ingredient of the bialgebraic characterization of local varieties of regular languages by Rhodes et al. [19] is that it established a new representation-theory-based approach to the study of the structure of varieties of regular languages.

Remark 8. Instead of bialgebras over $\mathbb{F}_2$, one can use *Boolean comonoids* (i.e. comonoid objects in the category **Bool** of Boolean algebras and lattice homomorphisms). In fact, Rhodes et al. proved that Boolean comonoids and bialgebras over $\mathbb{F}_2$ are equivalent structures in the sense that they form equivalent categories. Although Boolean comonoids are in fact compatible with semi-galois categories in the sense that the category of comodules

over a Boolean comonoid is an opposite of a semi-galois category (this is an easy consequence from the duality $\mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon} \simeq \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$ and Stone's duality theorem), the current paper does not deal with this matter in order to focuss our attention to semi-galois categories, not to Boolean comonoids.

To conclude this subsection, we proceed to the representation of the lattice $\mathfrak{D}_A$ of local varieties of finite actions over A in a way parallel to the above results. For this purpose, semi-galois categories play the same role as profinite monoids for $\mathfrak{M}_A$; and bialgebras for $\mathfrak{R}_A$.

First, let $\mathscr{V}_A$ be any class of finite actions over an alphabet A; and define a category $\mathbf{DFA}(\mathscr{V}_A)$ to be the full subcategory of A-$\mathbf{DFA}$ (cf. §2) whose objects are finite actions that belong to $\mathscr{V}_A$. (Recall that we identify finite actions with DFAs.) Also, denote by $\mathrm{F}_{\mathscr{V}_A} : \mathbf{DFA}(\mathscr{V}_A) \to \mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ the restriction of the forgetful functor $\mathrm{F}_A : A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA} \to \mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ to the subcategory $\mathbf{DFA}(\mathscr{V}_A) \subseteq A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}$. Then:

Lemma 5. *A class $\mathscr{V}_A$ of finite actions over A forms a local variety of finite actions over A if and only if $\langle \mathbf{DFA}(\mathscr{V}_A), \mathrm{F}_{\mathscr{V}_A} \rangle$ is a semi-galois subcategory of $\langle A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_A \rangle$ (i.e. a subobject of $\langle A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_A \rangle$ in* $\mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}$*).*

Now, we denote by $\mathfrak{D}'_A$ the lattice of (isomorphism classes of) subobjects of the semi-galois category $\langle A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_A \rangle$ in $\mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}$; by the assignment $\mathscr{V}_A \mapsto \langle \mathbf{DFA}(\mathscr{V}_A), \mathrm{F}_{\mathscr{V}_A} \rangle$, we then obtain an isomorphism of lattices as follows:

Proposition 4. *There is a canonical isomorphism $\mathfrak{D}_A \simeq \mathfrak{D}'_A$ of lattices.*

4.3. **The variety theorems via duality theorems.** These representations of the lattices $\mathfrak{R}_A, \mathfrak{M}_A, \mathfrak{D}_A$ of local varieties are used in proving the target representations $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{R}', \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{M}', \mathfrak{D} \simeq \mathfrak{D}'$. To describe it, we start with recalling the idea of Rhodes et al. [19] of regarding varieties of regular languages (= $\mathbf{Free}.\mathbf{Mon}$-varieties) as suitable functors from $\mathbf{Free}.\mathbf{Mon}$ to $\mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}}$. (Since their method can be applied to arbitrary $\mathbf{C}$-varieties of regular languages, their method is rephrased in our terminologies here.)

Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a $\mathbf{C}$-variety of regular languages, and put $\mathcal{V}_A := \{L \in \mathrm{Reg}(A) \mid L \in \mathcal{V}\}$ for each alphabet A. Then, by definition, each $\mathcal{V}_A$ is clearly a local variety of regular languages over A (cf. Definition 13). Thus, by Proposition 3, each $\mathcal{V}_A$ is a sub-bialgebra of the bialgebra $\mathrm{Reg}(A)$; in particular, $\mathcal{V}_A \in \mathbf{BiAlg}$. Moreover, the assignment $\mathbf{C} \ni A^* \mapsto \mathcal{V}_A \in \mathbf{BiAlg}$ on objects extends to a functor, denoted $\mathcal{V} : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}}$, by assigning to each $f : A^* \to B^* \in \mathbf{C}$ the inverse map $f^{-1} : \mathcal{V}_B \to \mathcal{V}_A$. (Note that this is well-defined because $\mathcal{V}$ satisfies the axiom **R4**, i.e. for each $L \in \mathcal{V}_B$ the inverse image $f^{-1}L \in \mathrm{Reg}(A)$ belongs to $\mathcal{V}_A$.) Thus, each $\mathbf{C}$-variety $\mathcal{V}$ of regular languages defines a functor $\mathcal{V} : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}}$ in a canonical way.

In particular, let Reg be the $\mathbf{C}$-variety of regular languages such that $\mathrm{Reg}_A = \mathrm{Reg}(A)$, i.e. the $\mathbf{C}$-variety consisting of all regular languages. Then this $\mathbf{C}$-variety of regular languages also defines a functor denoted $\mathrm{Reg} : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}}$; and other functors $\mathcal{V} : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}}$ induced from $\mathbf{C}$-varieties are all subfunctors of this functor $\mathrm{Reg} : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}}$. Conversely, every subfunctors of the functor $\mathrm{Reg} : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}}$ arise in this way; in other words, $\mathbf{C}$-varieties of regular languages bijectively correspond to (isomorphism classes of)

subfunctors of Reg : $\mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}}$. In summary, if we denote by $\mathfrak{R}'$ the lattice consisting of (isomorphism classes of) subfunctors of Reg : $\mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}}$, then this argument concludes that:

Theorem 4 (Rhodes and Steinberg, [19])**.** *There is a canonical isomorphism $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{R}'$ of lattices.*

By the same construction, this argument applies to the lattices $\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{D}$ as well, which we now sketch briefly.

First, let $FC : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon}$ be the functor that assings to each A^* its free profinite completion $\hat{A}^*$; and to each arrow $f : A^* \to B^* \in \mathbf{C}$ the canonically induced homomorphism $\hat{f} : \hat{A}^* \to \hat{B}^*$. Now, denote by $\mathfrak{M}'$ the lattice consisting of (isomorphism classes of) quotients of the functor $FC : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon}$ (that is ordered in the same way as $\mathfrak{M}'_A$). Using Proposition 2 instead of Proposition 3 in the above argument, we obtain:

Theorem 5. *There is a canonical isomorphism $\mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{M}'$ of lattices.*

Similarly, let $DFA : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$ denote the functor that assigns to each A^* the semi-galois category $\langle A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_A \rangle$; and to each $f : A^* \to B^* \in \mathbf{C}$ the arrow $\mathscr{R}(\hat{f}) : \langle B\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_B \rangle \to \langle A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_A \rangle$ in **Semi-Galois**. (Here, we identify $\langle A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_A \rangle$ with $\langle \hat{A}^*\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_{\hat{A}^*} \rangle$; and the arrow $\mathscr{R}(\hat{f})$ is the one defined in §3.3.) Denote by $\mathfrak{D}'$ the lattice consisting of (isomorphism classes of) subfunctors of $DFA : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$. Using Proposition 4 instead of Proposition 3 in the above argument, we obtain:

Theorem 6. *There is a canonical isomorphism $\mathfrak{D} \simeq \mathfrak{D}'$ of lattices.*

Finally, in order to deduce the target isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$, it is sufficient to prove the isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R}' \simeq \mathfrak{M}' \simeq \mathfrak{D}'$. Since the later lattices consist of functors from $\mathbf{C}$ to $\mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}}, \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon}$ and $\mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$ respectively, their isomorphisms can be proved as direct consequences from the dualities $\mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}} \simeq \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon}$ (Theorem 8.4.10, [19]) of Rhodes et al.; and $\mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon} \simeq \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$ (§3.3, Theorem 3); and also the fact that the bialgebra $\mathrm{Reg}(A)$ corresponds to $\hat{A}^*$ under the duality $\mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}} \simeq \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon}$ (cf. §8.4, [19]); and that $\hat{A}^*$ corresponds to $\langle A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_A \rangle$ under the duality $\mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon} \simeq \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$. This argument completes the proof of the isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$.

Remark 9. The isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$ are constructed here as the composition of the isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{R}', \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{M}', \mathfrak{D} \simeq \mathfrak{D}'$ and $\mathfrak{R}' \simeq \mathfrak{M}' \simeq \mathfrak{D}'$. By chasing the compositions, it can be seen that the compositions coincide with the original isomorphisms given by Straubing [23] and Chaubard et al. [8]— the original isomorphisms are given based on the constructions of syntactic monoids, transformation monoids and recognitions of regular languages; the claim stated in Example 5, §3.3, follows from this fact.

5. Examples

Briefly speaking, the purpose of this yet another proof of the variety theorems is (I) to give a specific representation of the lattices $\mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{D}$— by $\mathfrak{R}', \mathfrak{M}'$ and $\mathfrak{D}'$ in particular; and by this representation, (II) to give a more transparent and well-organized view on the mutual isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$ of lattices, i.e. the classical variety theorems. Since the actual issue in the Eilenberg variety theory is to determine explicitly correspondences

between individual varieties, it is a fundamental problem in this theory to improve the transparency of their correspondences.

Our proof given above says that (I) the lattices $\mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{D}$ of $\mathbf{C}$-varieties are isomorphic to the lattices $\mathfrak{R}', \mathfrak{M}'$ and $\mathfrak{D}'$ that consist of functors from $\mathbf{C}$ to $\mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}}, \mathbf{Prof.Mon}$ and $\mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$ respectively; and (II) under this representation, the isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$ are natural consequences from the duality between bialgebras over $\mathbb{F}_2$, profinite monoids, and semi-galois categories. From the standpoint that we mentioned above, this implies that the next problem of our concern is to determine the correspondence between these algebraic structures, rather than those between $\mathbf{C}$-varieties as originally formulated. In the current section, we consider some correspondences between profinite monoids and semi-galois categories in particular, because semi-galois categories (even those which are equivalent to what we call semi-galois categories) have been less studied in the literature in themselves, compared to the structure of bialgebras over fields and profinite monoids.

Two simple examples are studied here in order to observe one phenomenon shared by these examples. To be specific, we compare (I) when the fundamental monoid $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ of a semi-galois category $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ becomes a group; and (II) when $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ becomes $\mathcal{L}$-trivial. By these examples we observe what sort of categorical-algebraic properties of semi-galois categories can characterize the pseudo-identity definable properties (I) and (II) of fundamental monoids (i.e. $x^\omega = 1$ and $x(yx)^\omega = (yx)^\omega$ respectively); the observation below indicates that these pseudo-identity definable properties are equally characterized in terms of poset structures of subobjects in semi-galois categories. For more discussion on some general lesson from these observations, see §6.

5.1. **When $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ is a group.** Of course, this is exactly when a given semi-galois category $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ is in fact a *galois category* [12]. Here, in order to make it possible to compare the following argument with this well-known case, we start with recalling a characterization of galois categories.

According to the original axiom of galois categories, the property that makes semi-galois categories $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ into galois categories is that: for an arbitrary object $X \in \mathscr{C}$ and its subobject $X' \hookrightarrow X$, there exists a subobject $X'' \hookrightarrow X$ such that the induced coproduct $X' \sqcup X'' \hookrightarrow X$ is an isomorphism. We call such an object $X'' \hookrightarrow X$ the *complement* of $X' \hookrightarrow X$; and if X admits such complements for every subobjects, let us say that X is *complementable*. With these notions, galois categories are characterized as follows under the axiom of semi-galois categories:

Proposition 5 (e.g. [25])**.** *Let $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ be a semi-galois category. Then the following properties are equivalent:*

(1) every object $X \in \mathscr{C}$ is complementable, i.e. $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ is a galois category;
(2) every galois object $X \in \mathscr{C}$ is complementable;
(3) $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ is a group;
(4) $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ satisfies the pseudo-identity $x^\omega = 1$;

where $1 \in \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ is the identity.

Generally speaking, we are concerned with what categorical properties of $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ appear in place of 1 and 2 above when we replace the property 3 ($\Leftrightarrow$ 4) with other pseudo-identity

definable properties of $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$. The next subsection studies this problem by replacing 3 and 4 above with the property that $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ satisfies the pseudo-identity $x(yx)^\omega = (yx)^\omega$, i.e. $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ is $\mathcal{L}$-trivial. As shown below, the $\mathcal{L}$-triviality of $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ also can be characterized by the *acyclicity* of each object $X \in \mathscr{C}$; similarly to the complementability, the acyclicity is defined in terms of the structure of the lattice $\mathrm{Sub}(X)$ of subobjects of (i.e. monomorphisms into) each object $X \in \mathscr{C}$. (The complementability of X means that the lattice $\mathrm{Sub}(X)$ is a Boolean algebra.)

5.2. **When $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ is $\mathcal{L}$-trivial.** Let $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ be a semi-galois category. The *size* of an object $X \in \mathscr{C}$ is the number of elements of $\mathrm{F}(X)$ and is denoted $|X|$. If there is a monomorphism $X' \hookrightarrow X$ for $X, X' \in \mathscr{C}$, we denote this fact as $X' \leq X$ (i.e. X' is a subobject of X; generally, we identify isomorphic subobjects). A subobject $X' \leq X$ is called *maximal* or *coprime* if $X' \neq X$, and $X' \leq Y \leq X$ implies $X' = Y$ or $Y = X$. When this is the case, we denote $X' \lhd X$. Then, an object $X \in \mathscr{C}$ is called *acyclic* if there exists a sequence of coprime subobjects $X = X_0 \rhd X_1 \rhd \cdots \rhd X_n = \emptyset$ with $n = |X|$.

The terminology "acyclic" is named after the following fact.

Example 6. Let M be a profinite monoid. Then a finite left M-set $\rho : M \times S \to S$ is acyclic in M-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ if and only if, for every $\xi, \xi' \in S$ and $m, m' \in M$, the equalities $m \cdot \xi = \xi'$ and $m' \cdot \xi' = \xi$ imply $\xi = \xi'$.

Example 7. In particular, let A be an alphabet. Then a DFA $\delta : A \times S \to S$ is acyclic in $\langle A\text{-}\mathbf{DFA}, \mathrm{F}_A \rangle$ if and only if its underlying directed graph is acyclic.

With these terminology, we can prove the following fact that characterizes when $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ is $\mathcal{L}$-trivial.

Proposition 6. *Let $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ be a semi-galois category. Then the following properties are equivalent:*

(1) every object $X \in \mathscr{C}$ is acyclic;
(2) every galois object $X \in \mathscr{C}$ is acyclic;
(3) $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ is $\mathcal{L}$-trivial;
(4) $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ satisfies the pseudo-identity $x(yx)^\omega = (yx)^\omega$.

It should be worthwhile to mention that this proposition can be proved by an abstract-algebraic and categorical-algebraic argument based on the expression of the fundamental monoid $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}) \simeq \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$. Since this expression allows us to directly relate the categorical structure of $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ with the algebraic structure of $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$, we need not to apply the stronger result that $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ is in fact equivalent to more concrete semi-galois category $\langle \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_{\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})} \rangle$ of finite $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$-sets (Theorem 3, §3.3). Specifically, the expression $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}) \simeq \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ is used to prove the equivalence of 2 and 3; the equivalence of 1 and 2 is proved by the general fact that every object X is a surjective image $X_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup X_n \twoheadrightarrow X$ of coproduct of galois objects $X_1, \cdots, X_n$; the equivalence of 3 and 4 is a standard fact about profinite monoids. (The same argument is also applied to a proof of the proposition in the previous subsection.)

6. Summary and Discussions

This paper introduced and studied the class of semi-galois categories (§3) to develop a duality-based framework of the classical Eilenberg variety theory (§2). In this relation, we presented a duality theorem between semi-galois categories and profinite monoids (Theorem 3, §3.3); and we have seen that the isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$ of the lattices of **C**-varieties (i.e. the variety theorems of Straubing [23] and Chaubard et al. [8]) can be proved via the duality theorem $\mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon} \simeq \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$ for profinite monoids and semi-galois categories, and the duality theorem $\mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}} \simeq \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon}$ for bialgebras and profinite monoids given by Rhodes et al. [19] (§4). In the last section (§5), we gave two simplest examples concerning the relationship between the structure of semi-galois categories and their fundamental monoids; by these examples, we discussed how the expression $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}) \simeq \lim_{\Gamma} \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ of fundamental monoids is used in examining the relationship between categorical properties of semi-galois categories and algebraic properties of their fundamental monoids.

Generally speaking, a point that we have emphasized here is that the correspondences between **C**-varieties of (i) regular languages, (ii) finite stamps, and (iii) finite actions can be understood as the dualities between three algebraic structures of interest in their own right, i.e. (i') bialgebras over $\mathbb{F}_2$ (= Boolean comonoids), (ii') profinite monoids, and (iii') semi-galois categories; in fact, formally speaking, the isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$ of the lattices of **C**-varieties are determined by the isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R}' \simeq \mathfrak{M}' \simeq \mathfrak{D}'$ which are obtained from the dualities $\mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}} \simeq \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon} \simeq \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$ for (i'), (ii') and (iii') up to the isomorphisms of the lattices, $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{R}', \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{M}', \mathfrak{D} \simeq \mathfrak{D}'$ (§4.3). This fact strongly motivates us to investigate the structure of (i') bialgebras over $\mathbb{F}_2$ (= Boolean comonoids), (ii') profinite monoids, and (iii') semi-galois categories in place of the structure of **C**-varieties; and the relationship between (i'), (ii') and (iii') under the dualities $\mathbf{BiAlg}^{\mathbf{op}} \simeq \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon} \simeq \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$ in place of the relationship between **C**-varieties under the isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R} \simeq \mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{D}$ of the variety theorems. The fifth section §5 is intended to provide an example of this type of investigations; there, compared to the others, our attention was focussed to the relationship between (ii') profinite monoids and (iii') semi-galois categories in particular.

Generally, we regard semi-galois categories as algebraic structures of interest in their own right, at the same level as (i') bialgebras over $\mathbb{F}_2$ (= Boolean comonoids) and (ii') profinite monoids; then, one of the major purposes of this paper is to describe how semi-glois categories play a role as intermediate structures connecting (i') and (ii')— that is, semi-galois categories are both (I) categories of finite comodules over Boolean comonoids and (II) categories of finite left M-sets for profinite monoids M (see Remark 8, §4.2). In the context of finite semigroup theory, it is natural and even traditional to study categories as an extension of monoids (e.g. [24]). Indeed, for instance, such an idea plays a fundamental role in the study of semidirect-product decompositions of finite semigroups (e.g. [20, 21]); moreover, as far as the classical Eilenberg variety theory is concerned, we have seen that it makes sense to study the general relationship between the structure of semi-galois categories and profinite monoids via the construction of fundamental monoids. Since semi-galois categories are locally finite and dual to profinite monoids, the class of semi-galois categories will provide a relatively amenable class of categories of interest amongst others. The general

study on the structure of semi-galois categories will be developed in another place [**?**]—the current paper was particularly commited to providing fundamental results concerning semi-galois categories with an emphasis on the relationship to the classical Eilenberg variety theory.

References

[1] Eiichi Abe. *Hopf Algebras*. Number 74 in Cambridge Tracks in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge New York, 1980.

[2] Jirí Adámek, Stefan Milius, Robert Myers, and Henning Urbat. Generalized Eilenberg variety theorem I: local varieties of languages. In *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures*, pages 366–380, 2014.

[3] Jirí Adámek, Robert Myers, Henning Urbat, and Stefan Milius. Varieties of languages in a category. In *30th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2015, Kyoto, Japan, July 6–10, 2015*, pages 414–425, 2015.

[4] Mikolaj Bojańczyk. Recognizable languages over monads. In *19th International Conference Development in Language Theory (DLT 2015)*, volume 9168 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–13. Springer, 2015.

[5] Alain Brguières. Dualité de Galois-Grothendieck et dualité Tannakienne, 2013. Available at `http://www.math.univ-montp2.fr/~bruguieres/docs/galois_tannaka_anniv_georges_2013.pdf`.

[6] Alain Brguières. private communication, February 2016.

[7] Janusz Brzozowski and Faith Fich. Languages of R-trivial languages. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 20(1):32–49, 1980.

[8] Laura Chaubard, Jean-Eric Pin, and Howard Straubing. Actions, wreath products of C-varieties and concatenation products. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 356:73–89, 2006.

[9] Lian-Ting Chen and Henning Urbat. A fibrational approach to automata theory. In *6th International Conference on Algebra and Coalgebra in Computer Science (CALCO 2015)*, volume 35, pages 50–65, 2015.

[10] Samuel Eilenberg. *Automata, Languages and Machines, vol. B*. Academic Press, New York, 1976.

[11] Mai Gehrke, Serge Grigorieff, and Jean-Eric Pin. Duality and equational theory of regular languages. In *Automata, Languages and Programming, 35th International Colloquium, ICALP 2008*, pages 246–257, 2008.

[12] Alexander Grothendieck and Michele Raynaud. Revêtements ètales et groupe fondamental (SGA 1). Available from: `http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0206203`, 2002.

[13] Jean-Eric Pin. Mathematical foundation of automata theory. Available from: `http://www.liafa.jussieu.fr/~jep/PDF/MPRI/MPRI.pdf`.

[14] Jean-Eric Pin. A variety theorem without complementation, 1995.

[15] Libor Polák. Syntactic semirings of a language. In *International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS)*, volume 2136 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 611–620. Springer, 2001.

[16] Hilary Priestley. Representation of distributive lattices by means of ordered Stone spaces. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 2:186–190, 1970.

[17] J Reiterman. The Birkhoff theorem for finite algebras. *Algebra Universalis*, 14(1):1–10, 1982.

[18] Christophe Reutenauer. Séries formelles et algèbres syntactiques. *J. Algebra*, 66:448–483, 1980.

[19] John Rhodes and Benjamin Steinberg. *The* `q`*-Theory of Finite Semigroups*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, 2008.

[20] John Rhodes and Pascal Weil. Decomposition techniques for finite semigroups, using categories I. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 62:269–284, 1989.

[21] John Rhodes and Pascal Weil. Decomposition techniques for finite semigroups, using categories II. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 62:285–312, 1989.

[22] P. M. Schützenberger. On finite monoids having only trivial subgroups. *Inform. Contr.*, 8:190–194, 1965.

[23] Howard Straubing. On logical descriptions of regular languages. In *LATIN 2002*, Lect. Notes Comp. Sci. Springer, 2002.
[24] Bret Tilson. Categories as algebra: An essential ingredient of the theory of monoids. *J. Pure and Appl. Alg.*, 48:83–198, 1987.
[25] Fabio Tonini. Notes on Grothendieck-Galois theory, October 2009.
[26] Takeo Uramoto. Eilenberg's variety theory by duality theory (Japanese). *RIMS Kokyuroku*, 1915:100–112, September 2014.
[27] Takeo Uramoto. Semi-galois categories I: The classical Eilenberg variety theory. In *Proc. the 31st Annual ACM/IEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS2016)*, 2016. to appear.

Appendix A. Proof of The Duality Theorem

The rest of this paper provides an elementary full proof of the duality theorem **Prof**.**Mon** $\simeq$ **Semi-Galois**$^{\mathbf{op}}$ (§3.3, Theorem 3). In order to make the following argument readable independently of the main contents, this appendix includes the definitions and constructions of almost of all notions (e.g. galois objects, fundamental monoids), except the definition of semi-galois categories (cf. §3).

A.1. **Elementary remarks.** This section gathers some elementary properties of semi-galois categories that will be used throughout this appendix. The first three lemmas are standard in category theory or easy consequences from the axiom of semi-galois categories; and thus the proof is omitted.

Lemma 6. *A semi-galois category has equalizers and coequalizers for every pair of parallel arrows $h, k : X \to Y$; and also, the fiber functor* F *preserves them.*

Lemma 7. *Let $f : X \to Y$ be an arrow in a semi-galois category $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$.*

(1) f is an epimorphism in $\mathscr{C}$ if and only if f_* is a surjection in $\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$*;*
(2) f is a monomorphism in $\mathscr{C}$ if and only if f_* is an injection in $\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$*.*

Lemma 8. *The fiber functor* $\mathrm{F} : \mathscr{C} \to \mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ *is faithful: i.e. for each parallel arrows $h, k : X \to Y$, the equality $h_* = k_*$ implies $h = k$.*

In particular, the set $\mathrm{Hom}(X, Y)$ of arrows from X to Y is a finite set for each object $X, Y \in \mathscr{C}$.

Definition 16 (Universal quotient)**.** Let X be an object in $\mathscr{C}$ and $E \subseteq \mathrm{End}(X) \times \mathrm{End}(X)$ be a subset of $\mathrm{End}(X)$. Then, an arrow $p : X \to Y$ is called the *universal quotient* of X by E if the following conditions hold:

(1) p *equalizes* E: i.e. $hp = kp$ for every $(h, k) \in E$;
(2) if an arrow $g : X \to Z$ equalizes E, then g uniquely factors through p: i.e. there exists a unique arrow $\bar{g} : Y \to Z$ such that $g = p\bar{g}$.

(4)



It is easy to see that a universal quotient $p : X \to Y$ by any subset $E \subseteq \mathrm{End}(X) \times \mathrm{End}(X)$ must be an epimorphism and unique up to canonical isomorphism. Thus, we denote it as $p_E : X \twoheadrightarrow X/E$.

Lemma 9. *Let $E \subseteq \mathrm{End}(X) \times \mathrm{End}(X)$ be any subset; and $\hat{E} \subseteq \mathrm{End}(X) \times \mathrm{End}(X)$ be the smallest left congruence of the monoid* $\mathrm{End}(X)$ *containing E. Then p_E and $p_{\hat{E}}$ are isomorphic. In other words, every universal quotient is the one by a left congruence on* $\mathrm{End}(X)$*.*

Proof. By definition, it is clear that $p_{\hat{E}}$ factors through p_E. To see the converse, let $E' := \{(h, k) \in \mathrm{End}(X) \times \mathrm{End}(X) \mid hp_E = kp_E\}$ that is clearly a left congruence containing E. Thus, $\hat{E} \subseteq E'$. This means that p_E equalizes $\hat{E}$. Hence, p_E factors through $p_{\hat{E}}$. □

Lemma 10. *A semi-galois category $\mathscr{C}$ has arbitrary universal quotients.*

Proof. Let $X \in \mathscr{C}$ and $E \subseteq \mathrm{End}(X) \times \mathrm{End}(X)$, for which we construct a universal quotient $X \twoheadrightarrow X/E$. For each member $(h,k) \in E$, consider its coequalizer $q_{(h,k)} : X \twoheadrightarrow X_{(h,k)}$. Then one can take in $\mathscr{C}$ a finite pushout diagram for the family $\{q_{(h,k)} : X \twoheadrightarrow X_{(h,k)}\}_{(h,k)\in E}$.

(5)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{q_{(h,k)}} & X_{(h,k)} \\ {\scriptstyle q_{(h',k')}}\downarrow & \overset{\pi}{\searrow} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle l_{(h,k)}} \\ X_{(h',k')} & \xrightarrow[l_{(h',k')}]{} & W \end{array}$$

Note that every $l_{(h,k)}$ is an epimorphism; and thus we can define an epimorphism $\pi : X \twoheadrightarrow W$ so that the above diagram commutes: We prove that π is a universal quotient of X by E.

By definition, it is obvious that π equalizes E. Let $g : X \to Z$ equalize E. Then, $g : X \to Z$ factors through the coequalizer $q_{(h,k)} : X \twoheadrightarrow X_{(h,k)}$ for each $(h,k) \in E$: that is, there exists $g_{(h,k)} : X_{(h,k)} \to Z$ such that $g = q_{(h,k)}g_{(h,k)}$ for each $(h,k) \in E$. Since the diagram (5) is a pushout diagram, one obtains a unique arrow $g' : W \to Z$ such that $g_{(h,k)} = l_{(h,k)}g'$ for each $(h,k) \in E$. Then, one can see that $g = \pi g'$. Now, since π is an epimorphism, such a g' is unique, which concludes that π is indeed a universal quotient of X by E. □

Notice that $\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$, with the identity functor $\mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{Sets}_\omega} : \mathbf{Sets}_\omega \to \mathbf{Sets}_\omega$, is also a semi-galois category and has universal quotients. Then:

Corollary 1. *The fibre functor $\mathrm{F} : \mathscr{C} \to \mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ preserves universal quotients. That is, if $p : X \twoheadrightarrow X/E$ is a universal quotient of $X \in \mathscr{C}$ by $E \subseteq \mathrm{End}(X) \times \mathrm{End}(X)$, then its realization $p_* : \mathrm{F}(X) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{F}(X/E)$ in $\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ is a universal quotient by $\mathrm{F}(E) := \{(h_*, k_*) \mid (h,k) \in E\} \subseteq \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F}(X)) \times \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F}(X))$.*

Remark 10. More explicitly, the set $\mathrm{F}(X/E)$ can be described as the quotient $\mathrm{F}(X)/\equiv$ of the set $\mathrm{F}(X)$ by the smallest equivalence relation $\equiv$ on $\mathrm{F}(X)$ that contains the following subset of $\mathrm{F}(X) \times \mathrm{F}(X)$:

$$\{(\xi h_*, \xi k_*) \in \mathrm{F}(X) \times \mathrm{F}(X) \mid (h,k) \in E \ \wedge \ \xi \in \mathrm{F}(X)\}.$$

This remark will be used later (§A.5).

A.2. **Galois objects.** Throughout this section, we fix a semi-galois category $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$. To define the notion of galois objects in semi-galois categories, we need a few concepts including *coverings* and *rooted objects*.

Definition 17 (Covering)**.** A *covering* of an object Y is a finite family $\{\iota_i : Y_i \hookrightarrow Y\}_{i=1}^n$ of monomorphisms $\iota_i : Y_i \hookrightarrow Y$ $(1 \leq i \leq n)$ such that the induced morphism $\coprod_i \iota_i : \coprod_i Y_i \to Y$ is an epimorphism.

Definition 18 (Rooted object)**.** An object $X \in \mathscr{C}$ is called a *rooted object* if, for every object $Y \in \mathscr{C}$, arrow $f : X \to Y$ in $\mathscr{C}$ and covering $\{\iota_i : Y_i \hookrightarrow Y\}_{i=1}^n$ of Y, the arrow f

factors through some component $\iota_k : Y_k \hookrightarrow Y$ of the covering:



That is, there is an arrow $f_k : X \to Y_k$ such that $f = f_k \iota_k$.

Proposition 7. *An object $X \in \mathscr{C}$ is rooted if and only if, for every covering $\{\iota_i : X_i \hookrightarrow X\}_{i=1}^n$ of X, there exists an index i such that $\iota_i : X_i \hookrightarrow X$ is in fact an isomorphism.*

Proof. The only-if part is trivial from the definition. Conversely, let X be an object satisfying the condition, $f : X \to Y$ be an arrow, and $\{\iota_k : Y_k \hookrightarrow Y\}$ be a covering of Y. It suffices to show that f factors through some of ι_k. For this aim, consider the pullback $\{f^*\iota_k : f^*Y_k \hookrightarrow X\}$, which is easily proved to be a covering of X. By the assumption, there is an index k such that $f^*\iota_k : f^*Y_k \to X$ is an isomorphim, whence f factors through $\iota_k : Y_k \hookrightarrow Y$. This proves that X is rooted. □

Proposition 8. *Let X be a rooted object and $f : X \twoheadrightarrow Y$ be an epimorphism. Then Y is also rooted.*

Proof. Let $\{\iota_k : Y_k \hookrightarrow Y\}$ be a covering of Y. Since X is now rooted, f factors through some component $\iota_k : Y_k \hookrightarrow Y$.



Since f is an epimorphism, so is $\iota_k : Y_k \hookrightarrow Y$. Thus, ι_k is an isomorphism. □

Let $X \in \mathscr{C}$ be an arbitrary object. Since $\mathscr{C}$ has pullbacks, we can take intersections $X_1 \cap X_2 \hookrightarrow X$ of two monomorphisms $X_1 \hookrightarrow X$ and $X_2 \hookrightarrow X$. Since $\mathrm{F}(X)$ is a finite set, there exists a (unique) minimal subobject, denoting $X_\xi \hookrightarrow X$, for every element $\xi \in \mathrm{F}(X)$ such that $\xi \in \mathrm{F}(X_\xi)$. By definition, it is not difficult to see that X_ξ is rooted. In fact, one can also show the converse.

Proposition 9. *An object X is rooted if and only if $X = X_\xi$ for some $\xi \in \mathrm{F}(X)$.*

Proof. First, let X be rooted. Consider the family $\{X_\xi \hookrightarrow X\}_{\xi \in \mathrm{F}(X)}$, which is clearly a covering of X. By assumption, there is some component $X_\xi \hookrightarrow X$ that is an isomorphism. Thus $X = X_\xi$. Conversely, let $X = X_\xi$ and $\{Z_i \hookrightarrow X\}_{i=1}^n$ be a covering of X. Then there is an index i such that $\xi \in \mathrm{F}(Z_i)$, whence $X = X_\xi \subseteq Z_i \subseteq X$. Thus $Z_i \hookrightarrow X$ is an isomorphism, which concludes that X is rooted. □

Proposition 10. *Let $X \in \mathscr{C}$ be rooted and $\xi \in \mathrm{F}(X)$ be such that $X = X_\xi$. Then, for any $Y \in \mathscr{C}$, the map $\omega_{X,\xi} : \mathrm{Hom}(X, Y) \ni f \mapsto \xi f_* \in \mathrm{F}(Y)$ is injective.*

Proof. Let $f, g : X \to Y$ be arrows and $m : Z \hookrightarrow X$ be the equalizer of f and g. Then $\xi \in \mathrm{F}(Z)$. Let X_ξ be the minimal subobject of X containing ξ. By assumption $X = X_\xi$, and thus $X = X_\xi \subseteq Z \subseteq X$: i.e. $X = Z$. This proves that $f = g$. □

Definition 19 (Galois object)**.** A pair of an object $X \in \mathscr{C}$ and $\xi \in F(X)$ is said to be a *galois object* if $X = X_\xi$ and the map $\omega_{X,\xi} : \mathrm{End}(X) \ni f \mapsto \xi f_* \in F(X)$ is bijective.

Proposition 11. *For an arbitrary object $Y \in \mathscr{C}$, there exists a galois object (X, ξ) such that $\mathrm{Hom}(X, Y) \ni \sigma \mapsto \xi\sigma_* \in \mathrm{F}(Y)$ is a bijection. In particular, galois objects are cofinal in $\mathscr{C}$.*

Proof. Put $\mathrm{F}(Y) = \{\eta_1, \cdots, \eta_n\}$ and let $\alpha : X \hookrightarrow Y^n$ be the minimal subobject containing $\xi = (\eta_1, \cdots, \eta_n) \in \mathrm{F}(Y^n)$. We first show that (X, ξ) is a galois object. It is sufficient to prove that, for any $\gamma \in \mathrm{F}(X)$, there exists a unique $g \in \mathrm{End}(X)$ such that $\xi g_* = \gamma$. Let $\gamma\alpha_* = (\eta_{\tau(1)}, \cdots, \eta_{\tau(n)})$ where τ is a transformation on $\{1, \cdots, n\}$. Define $\hat{\tau} : Y^n \to Y^n$ to be an endomorphism of Y^n naturally induced from τ. Then $\xi\alpha_*\hat{\tau}_* = \gamma\alpha_*$. Since $\gamma \in \mathrm{F}(X) \cap (\mathrm{F}(X))\alpha_*\hat{\tau}_*$ and by the minimality of X, one can find an endomorphism $g : X \to X$ such that the following diagram commutes:

(6)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y^n & \xrightarrow{\hat{\tau}} & Y^n \\ {\scriptstyle\alpha}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle\alpha} \\ X & \overset{\exists g}{\dashrightarrow} & X \end{array}$$

Thus we have $\xi g_*\alpha_* = \xi\alpha_*\hat{\tau}^* = \gamma\alpha_*$. By the injectivity of α_*, we consequently obtain $\xi g_* = \gamma$. This shows that the map $\omega_{X,\xi} : \mathrm{End}(X) \ni g \mapsto \xi g_* \in \mathrm{F}(X)$ is surjective. By Proposition 10, it follows that $\omega_{X,\xi}$ is also injective and thus (X, ξ) is a galois object. Finally, let $\pi_i : Y^n \to Y$ be the projection onto the i-th component and σ^i be the composition $\sigma^i = \alpha\pi_i$. Then clearly $\xi\sigma_{i*} = \eta_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$. This proves that $\mathrm{Hom}(X, Y) \ni \sigma \mapsto \xi\sigma_* \in \mathrm{F}(Y)$ is surjective. Again, by Proposition 10, it is also injective and thus a bijection. □

Definition 20 (Optimal covering)**.** A covering $\{j_k : X_k \hookrightarrow X\}$ of X is said to be *optimal* if:

(1) Each X_k is rooted;
(2) If j_k can factor through j_l, then $k = l$.

Proposition 12. *Every object $X \in \mathscr{C}$ has an optimal covering, which is unique up to isomorphism.*

Proof. First, the existence of optimal covering is proved by induction on $|\mathrm{F}(X)|$. For the base step, assume that $|\mathrm{F}(X)| = 1$. Then the identity $\{\mathrm{id}_X : X \to X\}$ is an optimal covering of X. For the induction step, let X be such that $|\mathrm{F}(X)| = n + 1$. If X is rooted, then $\mathrm{id}_X : X \to X$ is an optimal covering of X. Otherwise, there is a covering $\{j_k : X_k \hookrightarrow X\}$ such that no $j_k : X_k \hookrightarrow X$ is an isomorphism, i.e. $|\mathrm{F}(X_k)| < n + 1$ in particular. By induction hypothesis, each X_k has an optimal covering. Using them, it is not difficult to construct an optimal covering of X.

Finally, for the proof of uniqueness, let $\{\lambda_i : X_i \hookrightarrow X\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\lambda'_k : X'_k \hookrightarrow X\}_{k=1}^m$ be optimal coverings of X. Since X_i is rooted and $\{\lambda'_k : X'_k \hookrightarrow X\}$ is a covering of X, $\lambda_i : X_i \hookrightarrow X$ factors through some $\lambda'_k : X'_k \hookrightarrow X$. One can see that such an index k is unique for i. In fact, assume that λ_i also factors through λ'_l. The inverse argument shows that λ'_k factors through some λ_j, which implies that λ_i factors through λ_j and thus $j = i$ by the optimality of $\{\lambda_i\}$. From the fact that λ'_k factors through λ_i and λ_i

factors through λ'_l, λ'_k factors through λ'_l and thus $k = l$. Therefore we can define a map $\sigma : \{1, \cdots, n\} \to \{1, \cdots, m\}$ so that λ_i factors through $\lambda'_{\sigma(i)}$. The above argument in fact proves that σ is an isomorphism (i.e. $n = m$ in particular), and that each of λ_i and $\lambda'_{\sigma(i)}$ factor through each other, i.e. isomorphic. □

Definition 21 (Root degree)**.** The *root degree* of an object $X \in \mathscr{C}$ (or simply *degree*) is defined as the size n of an optimal covering $\{\lambda_i : X_i \hookrightarrow X\}_{i=1}^n$.

A.3. **Fundamental monoids.** The monoid End(F) of natural endomorphisms F ⇒ F can be equipped with a canonical profinite topology so that End(F) forms a profinite monoid. In this section, we construct fundamental monoids using an inverse system based on galois object; and prove that it is canonically isomorphic to End(F). To construct the intended inverse system, several lemmas are in order:

Lemma 11. *Let (X, ξ) and (X', ξ') be galois objects. Then there is at most one arrow $\lambda : X \to X'$ such that $\xi\lambda_* = \xi'$; and if exists, the arrow λ is an epimorphism.*

Proof. The first claim follows from Proposition 10. To prove the second claim, let $\lambda : X \to X'$ be such that $\xi\lambda_* = \xi'$. Then, the image $\mathrm{Im}(\lambda) \subseteq X'$ contains ξ'. By the fact that $X' = X'_{\xi'}$, one obtains $\mathrm{Im}(\lambda) = X'$ because $X' = X'_{\xi'} \subseteq \mathrm{Im}(\lambda) \subseteq X'$. This shows that λ is an epimorphism. □

By this lemma, a pre-order $\leq$ on galois objects can be defined by $(X, \xi) \leq (X', \xi')$ if and only if there exists a *pointed arrow* $\lambda : (X', \xi') \to (X, \xi)$, i.e. $\xi'\lambda_* = \xi$. In what follows, this pre-ordered set of galois objects is denoted $\mathscr{G}$ that turns to be *cofiltered*. That is:

Lemma 12. *For an arbitrary pair of galois objects $(X, \xi), (X', \xi') \in \mathscr{G}$, there is a third galois object $(X'', \xi'') \in \mathscr{G}$ such that $(X, \xi) \leq (X'', \xi'')$ and $(X', \xi') \leq (X'', \xi'')$.*

Proof. Let (X, ξ) and $(X', \xi') \in \mathscr{G}$ be galois objects. By Proposition 11, there exist a galois object $(X'', \xi'') \in \mathscr{G}$ and $\sigma : X'' \to X \times X'$ such that $\xi''\sigma_* = (\xi, \xi') \in \mathrm{F}(X \times X')$. Let $\pi : X \times X' \to X$ and $\pi' : X \times X' \to X'$ be canonical projections. Then it is easy to see that $\sigma\pi : X'' \to X$ and $\sigma\pi' : X'' \to X'$ give the pre-ordering $(X'', \xi'') \geq (X, \xi)$ and $(X'', \xi'') \geq (X', \xi')$. □

The cofiltered pre-ordered set $\mathscr{G}$ is used below as the index set of an inverse system of finite monoids whose limit is isomorphic to End(F) as monoids. The inverse system consists of finite monoids $\mathrm{End}(X)$ where X ranges over all galois objects $(X, \xi) \in \mathscr{G}$. More precisely, the construction of the inverse system is based on the following two lemmas:

Lemma 13. *Let (X, ξ) and (X', ξ') be galois objects with $\lambda : (X, \xi) \to (X', \xi')$. Then, for every $u \in \mathrm{End}(X)$, there exists a unique $u' \in \mathrm{End}(X')$ such that the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{u} & X \\ {\scriptstyle\lambda}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\lambda} \\ X' & \xrightarrow[\exists! u']{} & X' \end{array}$$

Proof. The uniqueness follows from the fact that the pointed arrow $\lambda : (X, \xi) \to (X', \xi')$ between galois objects must be an epimorphism (cf. Lemma 11). For the existence, consider the element $\xi u_* \lambda_* \in \mathrm{F}(X')$. By the bijectivity of $\mathrm{End}(X') \ni v \mapsto \xi' v_* \in \mathrm{F}(X')$, there exists $u' \in \mathrm{End}(X')$ such that $\xi u_* \lambda_* = \xi' u'_*$, whence $\xi u_* \lambda_* = \xi \lambda_* u'_*$. By Proposition 10, we obtain $u\lambda = \lambda u'$. □

Lemma 14. *Let (X, ξ) and (X', ξ') be galois objects with $\lambda : (X, \xi) \to (X', \xi')$. Then the above correspondence $\mathrm{End}(X) \ni u \mapsto u' \in \mathrm{End}(X')$ is a surjective homomorphism of finite monoids.*

Proof. The uniqueness of u' shown in Lemma 13 proves that the correspondence $\mathrm{End}(X) \ni u \mapsto u' \in \mathrm{End}(X')$ is a monoid homomorphism. To see the surjectivity, it is sufficient to show that, for every $u' \in \mathrm{End}(X')$, there exists some $u \in \mathrm{End}(X)$ satisfying $u\lambda = \lambda u'$. For this aim, let $u' \in \mathrm{End}(X)$ be an arbitrary endomorphism on X', and consider the element $\xi' u'_* \in \mathrm{F}(X')$. By the surjectivity of $\lambda_* : \mathrm{F}(X) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{F}(X')$, there exists an element $\xi_1 \in \mathrm{F}(X)$ such that $\xi_1 \lambda_* = \xi' u'_*$. Also, by the bijectivity of $\mathrm{End}(X) \ni v \mapsto \xi v_* \in \mathrm{F}(X)$, there is $u_1 \in \mathrm{End}(X)$ such that $\xi_1 = \xi u_{1*}$. Then, $\xi u_{1*} \lambda_* = \xi \lambda_* u'_*$. Again, by Proposition 10, one obtains $u_1 \lambda = \lambda u'$. This proves the claim. □

For simplicity, we reserve capital Greeks $\Gamma, \Gamma' \cdots$ to name galois objects, e.g. $\Gamma = (X, \xi)$. Also, if we denote $\mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ for $\Gamma = (X, \xi) \in \mathscr{G}$, we mean $\mathrm{End}(\Gamma) := \mathrm{End}(X)$. For galois objects $\Gamma = (X, \xi)$ and $\Gamma' = (X', \xi')$ with $\Gamma' \leq \Gamma$, the induced surjective homomorphism $\mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{End}(\Gamma')$ is denoted $\rho^{\Gamma}_{\Gamma'}$.

Definition 22. The correspondence $\mathscr{G} \ni \Gamma \mapsto \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \in \mathbf{Fin}.\mathbf{Mon}$ defines an inverse system of finite monoids, where $\mathbf{Fin}.\mathbf{Mon}$ denotes the category of finite monoids and homomorphisms.

The limit of this inverse system $\{\mathrm{End}(\Gamma)\}_{\Gamma \in \mathscr{G}}$ is denoted $\varprojlim_{\Gamma} \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ or simply $\lim_{\Gamma} \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$. More explicitly, $\lim_{\Gamma} \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ consists of families $\mathbf{u} = \{u_\Gamma\}_{\Gamma \in \mathscr{G}}$ of endomorphisms $u_\Gamma \in \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ such that $\rho^{\Gamma}_{\Gamma'}(u_\Gamma) = u_{\Gamma'}$ for all $\Gamma' \leq \Gamma \in \mathscr{G}$. The multiplication of $\mathbf{u} = \{u_\Gamma\}_{\Gamma \in \mathscr{G}}$ and $\mathbf{v} = \{v_\Gamma\}_{\Gamma \in \mathscr{G}}$ is given by:

$$\mathbf{uv} \quad = \quad \{u_\Gamma v_\Gamma\}_{\Gamma \in G}. \tag{7}$$

The rest of this subsection is devoted to a proof of the following theorem:

Theorem 7. *There exists a canonical isomorphism of monoids:*

$$\delta : \varprojlim_{\Gamma} \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F}). \tag{8}$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{u} = \{u_\Gamma\} \in \lim_{\Gamma} \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$, from which we would like to define a natural endomorphism $\delta\mathbf{u} : \mathrm{F} \Rightarrow \mathrm{F} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$. For this aim, we first define a map $\delta\mathbf{u}_Y : \mathrm{F}(Y) \to \mathrm{F}(Y)$ for each object $Y \in \mathscr{C}$; then, we will show that the family $\delta\mathbf{u} = \{\delta\mathbf{u}_Y\}$ forms a natural endomorphism on F. Take $Y \in \mathscr{C}$ arbitrarily and let $\eta \in \mathrm{F}(Y)$. Then, by Proposition 11, there exists an arrow $\sigma : X \to Y$ from a galois object $\Gamma = (X, \xi)$ such that $\xi\sigma_* = \eta$. Define $\delta\mathbf{u}_Y(\eta) \in \mathrm{F}(Y)$ by:

$$\delta\mathbf{u}_Y(\eta) \quad := \quad \xi u_{\Gamma *} \sigma_*. \tag{9}$$

This is well-defined. That is:

Lemma 15. *The value of* $\delta\mathbf{u}_Y(\eta) \in \mathrm{F}(Y)$ *does not depend on the choice of the galois object* $\Gamma = (X, \xi)$ *and the arrow* $\sigma : X \to Y$ *with* $\xi\sigma_* = \eta$.

Proof. Let $\Gamma' = (X', \xi')$ and $\sigma' : X' \to Y$ be another choice. We need to prove the following equality:

$$\xi u_{\Gamma *}\sigma_* = \xi' u_{\Gamma' *}\sigma'_*. \tag{10}$$

By Lemma 12, there exists a galois object $\Gamma'' = (X'', \xi'')$ that has pointed arrows $\lambda : (X'', \xi'') \to (X, \xi)$ and $\lambda' : (X'', \xi'') \to (X', \xi')$. Then, we have $\xi = \xi''\lambda_*$ and $\xi' = \xi''\lambda_*$. So the required equation (10) is reduced to the following equality:

$$\xi''\lambda_* u_{\Gamma *}\sigma_* = \xi''\lambda'_* u_{\Gamma' *}\sigma'_*. \tag{11}$$

Since $\mathbf{u} \in \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$, we have $\rho_\Gamma^{\Gamma''}(u_{\Gamma''}) = u_\Gamma$ and $\rho_{\Gamma'}^{\Gamma''}(u_{\Gamma''}) = u_{\Gamma'}$. By the definition of $\rho_{\Gamma'}^{\Gamma}$, this means that $u_{\Gamma''}\lambda = \lambda u_\Gamma$ and $u_{\Gamma''}\lambda' = \lambda' u_{\Gamma'}$. Thus, the left and right hand sides of (11) are equal to $\xi'' u_{\Gamma'' *}\lambda_*\sigma_*$ and $\xi'' u_{\Gamma'' *}\lambda'_*\sigma'_*$ respectively. Finally, notice that $\lambda\sigma = \lambda'\sigma'$ because $\xi''\lambda_*\sigma_* = \xi\sigma_* = \eta = \xi'\sigma'_* = \xi''\lambda'_*\sigma'_*$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi''\lambda_* u_{\Gamma *}\sigma_* &= \xi'' u_{\Gamma'' *}\underline{\lambda_*\sigma_*} \\ &= \xi'' u_{\Gamma'' *}\underline{\lambda'_*\sigma'_*} \\ &= \xi''\lambda'_* u_{\Gamma' *}\sigma'_*. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the equation (11). □

Lemma 16. *The family* $\delta\mathbf{u} = \{\delta\mathbf{u}_Y\}_{Y \in \mathscr{C}}$ *is a natural endomorphism* $\mathrm{F} \Rightarrow \mathrm{F}$.

Proof. Let Y, Z be arbitrary objects in $\mathscr{C}$ and $f : Y \to Z$ be an arrow. We need to prove that $\delta\mathbf{u}_Z(\eta f_*) = \delta\mathbf{u}_Y(\eta) f_*$. Let (X, ξ) be a galois object with $\sigma : X \to Y$ such that $\xi\sigma_* = \eta$, whence $\xi\sigma_* f_* = \eta f_*$. Thus, by the definition of $\delta\mathbf{u}_Z$ and $\delta\mathbf{u}_Y$:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mathbf{u}_Z(\eta f_*) &= \xi u_{\Gamma *}(\sigma f)_* \\ &= \underline{\xi u_{\Gamma *}\sigma_*} f_* \\ &= \underline{\delta\mathbf{u}_Y(\eta)} f_*. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the naturality of $\delta\mathbf{u}$. □

By these lemmas, we obtain a map $\delta : \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$. In fact, δ is not only a map but also a homomorphism of monoids.

Lemma 17. *The map* $\delta : \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$ *is a homomorphism.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{u} = \{u_\Gamma\}, \mathbf{u}' = \{u'_\Gamma\} \in \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$. We want to show that $\delta(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}') = \delta(\mathbf{u}) \circ \delta(\mathbf{u}')$, which is done by object-wise argument. Let Y be an arbitrary object in $\mathscr{C}$ and $\eta \in \mathrm{F}(Y)$. Also, choose a galois object $\Gamma = (X, \xi)$ and an arrow $\sigma : X \to Y$ with $\xi\sigma_* = \eta$. By definition of $\delta\mathbf{u}'$, we have:

$$\delta\mathbf{u}'_Y(\eta) = \xi u'_{\Gamma *}\sigma_*, \tag{12}$$

which we denote $\eta' \in \mathrm{F}(Y)$. Since $\eta' = \xi(u'_\Gamma\sigma)_*$ and $u'_\Gamma\sigma : X \to Y$, the definition of $\delta\mathbf{u}_Y$ implies:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mathbf{u}_Y(\eta') &= \xi u_{\Gamma *}(u'_\Gamma\sigma)_* \\ &= \xi(u_\Gamma u'_\Gamma)_*\sigma_* \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{uu}' = \{u_\Gamma u'_\Gamma\}$ and $\eta = \xi\sigma_*$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\mathbf{u}_Y \circ \delta\mathbf{u}'_Y(\eta) &= \delta\mathbf{u}_Y(\eta') \\ &= \xi(u_\Gamma u'_\Gamma)_*\sigma_* \\ &= \delta(\mathbf{uu}')_Y(\eta).\end{aligned}$$

Since we took $Y \in \mathscr{C}$ and $\eta \in \mathrm{F}(Y)$ arbitrarily, this proves $\delta(\mathbf{uu}') = \delta\mathbf{u} \circ \delta\mathbf{u}'$. □

Finally, we prove that the homomorphism $\delta : \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$ is an isomorphism. First we show the injectivity of δ; and then the surjectivity of δ.

Lemma 18. *The homomorphism $\delta : \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$ is injective.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{u} = \{u_\Gamma\}, \mathbf{u}' = \{u'_\Gamma\} \in \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ be such that $\delta\mathbf{u} = \delta\mathbf{u}'$. From this, we would like to show that $u_\Gamma = u'_\Gamma$ for every $\Gamma = (X, \xi) \in \mathscr{G}$. To do so, it is sufficient to see $\xi u_{\Gamma *} = \xi u'_{\Gamma *}$ (cf. Proposition 10). Since $\xi = \xi \mathrm{id}_{X*}$ and by definition of $\delta\mathbf{u}, \delta\mathbf{u}'$, we have $\xi u_{\Gamma *} = \delta\mathbf{u}_X(\xi)$ and $\xi u'_{\Gamma *} = \delta\mathbf{u}'_X(\xi)$. But since we now have $\delta\mathbf{u} = \delta\mathbf{u}'$, this implies $\xi u_{\Gamma *} = \xi u'_{\Gamma *}$ as requested. □

Lemma 19. *The homomorphism $\delta : \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$ is surjective.*

Proof. Let $\phi \in \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$ be an arbitrary natural endomorphism on F, from which we now construct $\mathbf{u} = \{u_\Gamma\}_{\Gamma \in \mathscr{G}} \in \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ so that $\delta\mathbf{u} = \phi$. For this aim, take $u_\Gamma \in \mathrm{End}(X)$ for each $\Gamma = (X, \xi) \in \mathscr{G}$ so that $\xi u_{\Gamma *} = \phi_X(\xi)$— such a u_Γ exists because (X, ξ) is galois. We first see that $\mathbf{u} := \{u_\Gamma\}_\Gamma \in \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$; and second, we see that $\delta\mathbf{u} = \phi$.

First, let $\Gamma = (X, \xi)$ and $\Gamma' = (X', \xi') \in \mathscr{G}$ be galois objects such that $\Gamma \geq \Gamma'$. Then, there exists an arrow $\lambda : X \to X'$ with $\xi\lambda_* = \xi'$. By the naturality of ϕ, we have $\phi_X(\xi)\lambda_* = \phi_{X'}(\xi\lambda_*)$, i.e. $\xi u_{\Gamma *}\lambda_* = \xi\lambda_* u_{\Gamma' *}$ which proves $u_\Gamma\lambda = \lambda u_{\Gamma'}$. By definition of $\rho^\Gamma_{\Gamma'}$, this means that $\rho^\Gamma_{\Gamma'}(u_\Gamma) = u_{\Gamma'}$. In other words, $\mathbf{u} = \{u_\Gamma\}_\Gamma$ is indeed a member of $\lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$. Second, we see that $\delta\mathbf{u} = \phi$, i.e. $\delta\mathbf{u}_Y = \phi_Y$ for every object $Y \in \mathscr{C}$. Let $Y \in \mathscr{C}$, $\eta \in \mathrm{F}(Y)$, and $\sigma : X \to Y$ be an arrow from a galois object $\Gamma = (X, \xi)$ such that $\eta = \xi\sigma_*$. By definition of $\delta\mathbf{u}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\mathbf{u}_Y(\eta) &= \xi u_{\Gamma *}\sigma_* \\ &= \phi_X(\xi)\sigma_*\end{aligned}$$

By the naturality of ϕ, the right-most is equal to $\phi_Y(\xi\sigma_*) = \phi_Y(\eta)$. From this, it follows that $\delta\mathbf{u}_Y(\eta) = \phi_Y(\eta)$. Thus, $\delta\mathbf{u}_Y = \phi_Y$. □

Consequently, all these lemmas show that $\delta : \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$ is an isomorphism of monoids: the theorem is proved. □

Definition 23 (Fundamental monoids)**.** Let $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ be a semi-galois category. Then, the monoid $\mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$ forms a profinite monoid with respect to the topology induced by the isomorphism $\delta : \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$. We call the profinite monoid $\mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$ the *fundamental monoid* of $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$, and denote $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$.

A.4. **Reconstruction of profinite monoids.** The following three sections (§A.4 – §A.6) prove the opposite equivalence between (i) the category of profinite monoids and continuous homomorphisms, **Prof**.**Mon**; and (ii) the category of semi-galois categories and exact functors, **Semi-Galois**:

$$\mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon} \;\simeq\; \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}.$$

The proof consists of three parts. In the first part (§A.4), every profinite monoid M is proved isomorphic to the fundamental monoid $\pi_1(M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M)$ of the semi-galois category $\langle M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M\rangle$ of finite M-sets and M-equivariant maps; in the second part (§A.5), it is proved that every semi-galois category $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}\rangle$ is canonically equivalent to the semi-galois category $\langle \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_{\pi_1(\mathscr{C},\mathrm{F})}\rangle$; and in the last part (§A.6), we show the target opposite equivalence $\mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon} \simeq \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$, using the results proved in the first two parts §A.4 – §A.5.

We start with the first part of the proof. Let M be a profinite monoid and $\langle M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M\rangle$ be the semi-galois category of finite M-sets and M-equivariant maps. The purpose of this section is to prove the following:

Theorem 8 (The Reconstruction Theorem)**.** *There is a canonical isomorphism of profinite monoids:*

$$\lambda_M : M \xrightarrow{\simeq} \pi_1(M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M). \tag{13}$$

Let $Y = \langle S, \rho\rangle \in M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$. Then, by definition of finite M-sets, $\rho : M \to \mathrm{End}(S) = \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F}_M(Y))$ is a monoid homomorphism; and for each $m \in M$, defines an element $\rho(m) \in \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F}_M(Y))$, i.e. a map $\rho(m) : \mathrm{F}_M(Y) \to \mathrm{F}_M(Y)$. Consider the following family:

$$\lambda_M(m) \;:=\; \big\{\rho(m) : \mathrm{F}_M(Y) \to \mathrm{F}_M(Y)\big\}_{Y=\langle S,\rho\rangle \in M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega}. \tag{14}$$

Since M-equivariant maps (i.e. arrows in $M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$) preserve M-actions (i.e. $\rho(m)$), the family (14) defines a natural transformation $\mathrm{F}_M \Rightarrow \mathrm{F}_M$. Thus a map $\lambda_M : M \to \pi_1(M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M)$ is defined by mapping $m \in M$ to $\lambda_M(m) \in \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F}_M) = \pi_1(M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M)$. We now show that λ_M is a continuous isomorphism of profinite monoids.

For this purpose, it is sufficient to prove that the following composition is an isomorphism:

$$M \xrightarrow{\lambda_M} \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F}_M) \xrightarrow{\delta^{-1}} \varprojlim_{\Gamma} \mathrm{End}(\Gamma). \tag{15}$$

Here Γ ranges over all galois objects in $M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$; and $\delta : \varprojlim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F}_M)$ is the isomorphism that we constructed in the previous section (cf. Theorem 7). As shown in Lemma 19, the inverse $\delta^{-1} : \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F}_M) \to \varprojlim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ assigns to each $\phi \in \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F}_M)$ the family $\{u_\Gamma\} \in \varprojlim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ such that $\phi_X(\xi) = \xi u_{\Gamma *}$ for each galois object $\Gamma = (X, \xi)$ in $M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$. This means that the composition (15) assigns to each $m \in M$ the family $\{u^m_\Gamma\} \in \varprojlim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ such that $m \cdot \xi = \xi u^m_{\Gamma *}$ for each $\Gamma = (X, \xi)$.

To prove that (15) is an isomorphism, we first characterize galois objects in $M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$.

Lemma 20. *Let $\Gamma = (X, \xi)$ be a galois object in $M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$. Then, the equivalence $m \equiv_\Gamma m'$ given by $m \cdot \xi = m' \cdot \xi$ is a congruence on M of finite index.*

Proof. The relation $\equiv_\Gamma$ is obviously a left congruence of finite index. To see that $\equiv_\Gamma$ is also a right congruence, let $m \equiv_\Gamma m$ and $n \in M$; we show that $mn \equiv_\Gamma m'n$, i.e. $mn \cdot \xi = m'n \cdot \xi$. Since $\Gamma = (X, \xi)$ is a galois object, there exists $v \in \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ such that $n \cdot \xi = \xi v_*$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} mn \cdot \xi &= m \cdot (\xi v_*) \\ &= (m \cdot \xi) v_* \quad (\because v \text{ is an } M\text{-equivariant map.}) \\ &= (m' \cdot \xi) v_* \\ &= m' \cdot (\xi v_*) \\ &= m'n \cdot \xi. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $mn \equiv_\Gamma m'n$. □ □

Thus, the quotient monoid $H_\Gamma := M/\equiv_\Gamma$ is a finite monoid; and also, by the continuity of M-action on the set $\mathrm{F}_M(X)$, the canonical projection $p_\Gamma : M \twoheadrightarrow H_\Gamma$ is continuous.

In general, each finite quotient $p : M \twoheadrightarrow H$ of M onto a finite monoid H induces a finite M-set $X_H = \langle S_H, \rho_H \rangle \in M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$, which is formally defined as $\mathrm{F}_M(X_H) = S_H := H$ and $\rho_H : M \times S_H \to S_H$ is given by, for each $m \in M$ and $h \in H$,

$$\rho_H(m)(h) \quad := \quad p(m)h. \tag{16}$$

Let $e_H \in H = \mathrm{F}_M(X_H)$ denote the identity of H.

Lemma 21. *$\Gamma_H = (X_H, e_H)$ is a galois object in M-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$.*

Proof. First, X_H is rooted with $e_H \in \mathrm{F}_M(X_H)$ its root because every $h \in \mathrm{F}_M(X_H)$ is of the form $h = p(m)$ for some $m \in M$; and so, $h = m \cdot e_H$ by (16). Second, we see that $\omega : \mathrm{End}(X_H) \ni u \mapsto e_H u_* \in \mathrm{F}_M(X_H)$ is bijective. Since X_H is rooted, the map ω is injective. To see the surjectivity, let $h \in H = \mathrm{F}_M(X_H)$ be an arbitrary element. Notice that the right action $H \ni k \mapsto kh \in H$ defines an M-equivariant map $u_h : X_H \to X_H$, i.e. commutes with left M-action (16); and also, $e_H u_{h*} = h$. This shows that ω is indeed bijective; and thus, $\Gamma_H = (X_H, e_H)$ is a galois object in M-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$. □

Lemma 22. *Let $\Gamma = (X, \xi)$ be a galois object in M-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ and $p_\Gamma : M \twoheadrightarrow H_\Gamma$ be the finite quotient defined above. Then, Γ and Γ_{H_Γ} are isomorphic as M-sets. In other words, galois objects in M-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ are exactly those of the form Γ_H for some finite quotient $M \twoheadrightarrow H$.*

Proof. Define an arrow $X_{H_\Gamma} \xrightarrow{f} X$ by $\mathrm{F}_M(X_{H_\Gamma}) \ni [m] \mapsto m \cdot \xi \in \mathrm{F}_M(X)$, where $[m]$ denotes the $\equiv_\Gamma$-equivalence class containing $m \in M$. By definition of $\equiv_\Gamma$, this arrow is well-defined; and bijective by that ξ is a root of X. Also, by definition of Γ_{H_Γ}, it is easy to see that f preserves M-actions and maps the root $e_H = [e_M]$ to ξ. □

Lemma 23. *$H \simeq \mathrm{End}(\Gamma_H)$.*

Proof. The above construction $h \mapsto u_h$ of Lemma 21 defines a homomorphism $H \to \mathrm{End}(\Gamma_H)$. The injectivity is clear. To see the surjectivity, let $u \in \mathrm{End}(\Gamma_H)$ and $h := e_H u_*$. Since e_H is a root of X_H and $e_H u_* = h = e_H u_{h*}$, we have $u = u_h$. This proves that $H \ni h \mapsto u_h \in \mathrm{End}(\Gamma_H)$ is an isomorphism. □

Let $p : M \twoheadrightarrow H$ be a finite quotient and $q_H : H \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{End}(\Gamma_H)$ be the isomorphism of Lemma 23. Also, denote by $\gamma : M \to \mathrm{End}(\Gamma_H)$ the composition:

$$\gamma : M \xrightarrow{\lambda_M} \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F}_M) \xrightarrow{\delta^{-1}} \varprojlim_{\Gamma} \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \xrightarrow{\pi_{\Gamma_H}} \mathrm{End}(\Gamma_H) \tag{17}$$

where $\pi_{\Gamma_H} : \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{End}(\Gamma_H)$ is the canonical projection.

Lemma 24. *The following diagram commutes:*

(18)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{\ p\ } & H \\ & \searrow^{\gamma} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle q_H} \\ & & \mathrm{End}(\Gamma_H) \end{array}$$

Proof. Recall that the composition $M \xrightarrow{\lambda_M} \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F}_M) \xrightarrow{\delta^{-1}} \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ assigns to each $m \in M$ the family $\{u^m_\Gamma\} \in \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ such that $m \cdot \xi = \xi u^m_{\Gamma *}$ for every $\Gamma = (X, \xi)$. Since, by definition, $\gamma(m) \in \mathrm{End}(\Gamma_H)$ is the component $u^m_{\Gamma_H}$ of $\{u^m_\Gamma\}$ at the galois object $\Gamma_H = (X_H, e_H)$, it is characterized by the property that $p(m) = e_H \gamma(m)_*$, which also characterizes $q_H \circ p(m) \in \mathrm{End}(\Gamma_H)$ by definition of q_H on the other hand. Thus, we have $\gamma(m) = q_H \circ p(m)$ for each $m \in M$, i.e. $\gamma = q_H \circ p$. □

Let $\mathscr{F} = \{p_i : M \twoheadrightarrow H_i\}$ be the family of all finite quotients of M, which forms an inverse system of finite monoids by defining a pre-order $i \leq j$ if and only if there exists a (necessarily unique) homomorphism $\tau^j_i : H_j \to H_i$ such that $p_i = p_j \tau^j_i$. By taking the inverse limit of this system $\mathscr{F}$, we obtain a profinite monoid $\lim_i H_i$ and a canonical homomorphism $p : M \to \lim_i H_i$, which assigns to each $m \in M$ the family $\{p_i(m)\} \in \lim_i H_i$. It is well-known that this homomorphism $p : M \to \lim_i H_i$ is in fact an isomorphism of profinite monoids.

Thus we have successive isomorphisms of profinite monoids:

$$\begin{aligned} M &\xrightarrow{\simeq} \varprojlim_i H_i \quad \text{(induced by } p\text{)} \\ &\xrightarrow{\simeq} \varprojlim_i \mathrm{End}(\Gamma_{H_i}) \quad \text{(induced by } q_{H_i}\text{)} \\ &\xrightarrow{\simeq} \varprojlim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \quad (\because \text{by Lemma 20}) \end{aligned}$$

Then a careful chase of this sequence, using Lemma 24, shows that the composition of these isomorphisms is in fact equal to the composition $M \xrightarrow{\lambda_M} \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F}_M) \xrightarrow{\delta^{-1}} \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$. Thus, $\delta^{-1} \circ \lambda_M$ and also λ_M as well are isomorphisms of profinite monoids. This completes the proof of Theorem 8.

A.5. **Representation of semi-galois categories.** In this section, we prove the following:

Theorem 9 (Representation theorem)**.** *For an arbitrary semi-galois category $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$, there exists a canonical equivalence of categories $\Phi : \mathscr{C} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$-**Sets**$_\omega$ such that the following*

diagram commutes:

(19)


where $\mathrm{F}_{\pi_1(\mathscr{C},\mathrm{F})} : \pi_1(\mathscr{C},\mathrm{F})$-**Sets**$_\omega \to$ **Sets**$_\omega$ *is the forgetful functor.*

Proof. Throughout this proof, we denote $\pi_1 := \pi_1(\mathscr{C},\mathrm{F})$ for simplicity. Firstly, we define a functor $\Phi : \mathscr{C} \to \pi_1$-**Sets**$_\omega$ so that the diagram (19) commutes. After that, we give proofs of (i) the *fully faithfulness* of Φ and (ii) the *essentially surjectivity* of Φ.

Now we define a functor $\Phi : \mathscr{C} \to \pi_1$-**Sets**$_\omega$. Let $Y \in \mathscr{C}$ be an object. Then the fundamental monoid π_1 acts on the set $\mathrm{F}(Y)$ from the left by:

$$\pi_1 \times \mathrm{F}(Y) \ni (\phi, \eta) \longmapsto \phi_Y(\eta) \in \mathrm{F}(Y).$$

We denote this left action by $\rho_Y : \pi_1 \times \mathrm{F}(Y) \to \mathrm{F}(Y)$. To see that $\rho_Y \in \pi_1$-**Sets**$_\omega$, we need to see the continuity of ρ_Y.

Lemma 25. *The action ρ_Y is continuous with respect to the topology of π_1.*

Proof. To see this, it is sufficient to show that, for every $\eta, \eta' \in \mathrm{F}(Y)$, the following set is open in $\pi_1 = \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$:

$$U_{\eta,\eta'} \quad = \quad \{\phi \in \pi_1 \mid \phi_Y(\eta) = \eta'\}. \tag{20}$$

Recall that the topology of $\pi_1 = \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$ is induced from the isomorphism $\delta : \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$. Under this isomorphism, $U_{\eta,\eta'}$ corresponds to the subset of $\lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ given by:

$$\Big\{\mathbf{u} = \{u_\Gamma\} \in \varprojlim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \ \mid \ \xi_0 u_{\Gamma_0 *} \sigma_{0*} = \eta'\Big\}, \tag{21}$$

where $\sigma_0 : X_0 \to Y$ is a fixed arrow from a galois object $\Gamma_0 = (X_0, \xi_0) \in \mathscr{G}$ with $\xi_0 \sigma_{0*} = \eta$. By definition of the topology of $\lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$, the set (21) is clearly open in $\lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$. □

The assignment $\mathscr{C} \ni Y \mapsto \langle \mathrm{F}(Y), \rho_Y \rangle \in \pi_1$-**Sets**$_\omega$ gives the object portion of the functor $\Phi : \mathscr{C} \to \pi_1$-**Sets**$_\omega$. The arrow portion is given by, for an arrow $f : Y \to Z$ in $\mathscr{C}$,

$$\Phi(f) \quad := \quad f_* : \mathrm{F}(Y) \to \mathrm{F}(Z) \tag{22}$$

It is obvious that $\Phi(f) : \mathrm{F}(Y) \to \mathrm{F}(Z)$ is indeed π_1-equivariant (i.e. commutes with left actions of π_1) by the naturality of members in $\pi_1 = \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F})$ with respect to arrows in $\mathscr{C}$. Thus $\Phi(f) = f_*$ is an arrow from $\Phi(Y) = \langle \mathrm{F}(Y), \rho_Y \rangle$ to $\Phi(Z) = \langle \mathrm{F}(Z), \rho_Z \rangle$ in π_1-**Sets**$_\omega$. By this construction, it is clear that the diagram (19) commutes.

The proof of the theorem is established if we prove (i) the fully faithfulness of Φ; and (ii) the essentially surjectivity of Φ. To do so, we need a bit more effort.

Proposition 13. *The functor Φ is fully faithful.*

Proof. By definition, Φ is clearly faithful. So we prove the fullness of Φ. It is sufficient to show that, for arbitrary objects Y, Z in $\mathscr{C}$ and arrow $\sigma : \Phi(Y) \to \Phi(Z)$ in π_1-**Sets**$_\omega$, there exists an arrow $h : Y \to Z$ in $\mathscr{C}$ such that $\sigma = \Phi(h) = h_*$. We prove this claim by induction on the degree of Y. Before the proof, we need a lemma concerning epimorphisms from galois objects.

Lemma 26. *Let $(X,\xi)\in\mathscr{G}$ and $f:X\twoheadrightarrow Y$ be an epimorphism. Then, f is the universal quotient of X by the left congruence $E:=\{(h,k)\in\mathrm{End}(X)\times\mathrm{End}(X)\mid hf=kf\}$.*

Proof. Let $p_E:X\twoheadrightarrow X/E$ be a universal quotient of X by E. Since f equalizes E, f factors through p_E, i.e. there exists an arrow $t:X/E\to Y$ such that $f=p_Et$. Since f is an epimorphism, so is t. Thus, to complete the proof, it is sufficient to see that t_* is injective.

We now have the following two diagrams in $\mathscr{C}$ and in $\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ respectively:

(23)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \\ {\scriptstyle p_E}\downarrow & \nearrow_{t} & \\ X/E & & \end{array} \qquad\qquad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{F}(X) & \xrightarrow{f_*} & \mathrm{F}(Y) \\ {\scriptstyle p_{E*}}\downarrow & \nearrow_{t_*} & \\ \mathrm{F}(X/E) & & \end{array}$$

By Lemma 1, the map $p_{E*}:\mathrm{F}(X)\twoheadrightarrow\mathrm{F}(X/E)$ is a universal quotient of $\mathrm{F}(X)$ by $\mathrm{F}(E)$ in $\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$. Let us denote by $[\xi']\in\mathrm{F}(X/E)$ the equivalence class containing $\xi'\in\mathrm{F}(X)$. To prove that t_* is injective, assume that $[\xi_1]t_*=[\xi_2]t_*$, i.e. $\xi_1f_*=\xi_2f_*$. Since (X,ξ) is a galois object, there exist $h,k\in\mathrm{End}(X)$ such that $\xi_1=\xi h_*$ and $\xi_2=\xi k_*$. Thus, we obtain $\xi h_*f_*=\xi k_*f_*$. By Proposition 10, we have $hf=kf$ which implies $(h,k)\in E$. Since $(\xi_1,\xi_2)=(\xi h_*,\xi k_*)$ with $(h,k)\in E$, this proves that $[\xi_1]=[\xi_2]$ in $\mathrm{F}(X/E)$ (cf. Remark 10). Thus t_* is indeed injective. □

Lemma 27. *Let Y has degree one. Then for every arrow $\sigma:\Phi(Y)\to\Phi(Z)$ in π_1-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$, there exists $h:Y\to Z$ such that $\sigma=h_*$.*

Proof. Since Y is a rooted object, Proposition 9 shows that there exists $\eta\in\mathrm{F}(Y)$ such that $Y=Y_\eta$. By Proposition 11 and the fact that $\mathscr{G}$ is filtered, it is not difficult to see that there exist a galois object $(X,\xi)\in\mathscr{G}$ and an arrow $f:X\to Y$ such that (i) $\xi f_*=\eta$ and (ii) $\mathrm{Hom}(X,Z)\ni g\mapsto\xi g_*\in\mathrm{F}(Z)$ is bijective. Then, there exists $g\in\mathrm{Hom}(X,Z)$ such that $\xi g_*=\eta\sigma=\xi f_*\sigma$. Now, we have arrows as in the following diagrams in $\mathscr{C}$ and in π_1-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ respectively:

(24)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & & \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & \searrow^{g} & \\ Y & & Z \end{array} \qquad\qquad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{F}(X) & & \\ {\scriptstyle f_*}\downarrow & \searrow^{g_*} & \\ \mathrm{F}(Y) & \xrightarrow[\sigma]{} & \mathrm{F}(Z) \end{array}$$

Notice that, if we could prove that the right diagram commutes in π_1-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$, i.e. $g_*=f_*\sigma$, then it follows that there exists $h:Y\to Z$ in $\mathscr{C}$ such that $\sigma=h_*$ as requested. In fact, by Lemma 26, the epimorphism $f:X\twoheadrightarrow Y$ is the universal quotient $X\twoheadrightarrow X/E$ by some left congruence $E\subseteq\mathrm{End}(X)\times\mathrm{End}(X)$. Then, for every $(u,v)\in E$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} u_*g_* &= u_*(f_*\sigma) && (\because \text{we now assume } g_*=f_*\sigma)\\ &= v_*(f_*\sigma) && (\because f \text{ equalizes } \forall(u,v)\in E)\\ &= v_*g_*. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $ug=vg$. Since $f:X\twoheadrightarrow Y$ is universal with respect to equalizers of E, it follows that g factors through f, i.e. $g=fh$ for some $h:Y\to Z$. Then, $f_*h_*=g_*=f_*\sigma$ and the

surjectivity of f_* imply that $\sigma = h_*$. Hence, our task is reduced to proving that $g_* = f_*\sigma$. For this aim, notice that, since $(X, \xi) = \Gamma$ is galois, (i) $\mathrm{End}(X) \ni k \mapsto \xi k_* \in \mathrm{F}(X)$ is a bijection; and (ii) the canonical projection $\pi_1 \ni \delta\{u_\Gamma\} \mapsto u_\Gamma \in \mathrm{End}(X)$ is a sujection. From this, it follows that, for every $\xi' \in \mathrm{F}(X)$, there is $\phi \in \pi_1$ such that $\xi' = \phi_X(\xi)$. By this and the fact that $\sigma : \mathrm{F}(Y) \to \mathrm{F}(Z)$ is π_1-equivariant (i.e. commutes with $\forall \phi \in \pi_1$), we have: for every $\xi' = \phi_X(\xi) \in \mathrm{F}(X)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi' g_* &= \phi_Z(\xi g_*) && (\because g_* \text{ is } \pi_1\text{-equivariant}) \\ &= \phi_Z(\xi f_*\sigma) && (\because \text{definition of } g) \\ &= \phi_X(\xi) f_*\sigma && (\because f_* \text{ and } \sigma \text{ are } \pi_1\text{-equivariant}) \\ &= \xi' f_*\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\xi' \in \mathrm{F}(X)$ is choosen arbitrarily, this proves that $g_* = f_*\sigma$. □

Lemma 28. *If the above lemma holds for objects $Y \in \mathscr{C}$ with degree less than or equal to $n \geq 1$, then it also holds for all objects $Y \in \mathscr{C}$ with degree $n+1$.*

Proof. Let Y be an object with degree $n+1$. Then there is a covering $\{j_1 : Y_1 \hookrightarrow Y, j_2 : Y_2 \hookrightarrow Y\}$ of Y such that Y_1 has degree one and Y_2 has degree n. Let $\sigma : \mathrm{F}(Y) \to \mathrm{F}(Z)$ be an arrow in π_1-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$. Then, by induction hypothesis, there exist $f_1 : Y_1 \to Z$ and $f_2 : Y_2 \to Z$ with $f_{1*} = j_{1*}\sigma$ and $f_{2*} = j_{2*}\sigma$. Now, we have the following diagrams in $\mathscr{C}$ and in π_1-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$:

(25)



Consider a pullback diagram of j_1 and j_2 in $\mathscr{C}$:

(26)



and its image under $\Phi : \mathscr{C} \to \pi_1\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$, which is also a pullback diagram:

(27)



Since the out-most square of (27) in $\pi_1\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ commutes, so does the out-most square of (26) in $\mathscr{C}$ by the faithfulness of Φ. Also, it is easy to see that the pullback square in the first diagram in $\mathscr{C}$ is also a pushout square. Thus, there exists $h : Y \to Z$ that makes the diagram commutes. This arrow is the required one: i.e. $\sigma = h_*$. □

By these lemmas, the proof of the fully faithfulness of Φ is done. □

Finally, we prove the essentially surjectivity of Φ, which concludes the proof of the representation theorem.

Proposition 14. *The functor $\Phi : \mathscr{C} \to \pi_1\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ is essentially surjective.*

Proof. Let $\langle S, \rho\rangle \in \pi_1\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ be a finite left π_1-set. We need to prove that there exists $Y \in \mathscr{C}$ such that $\Phi(Y)$ is isomorphic to S as π_1-sets. The proof is by induction on the size $|S|$ of S. The case of $|S| = 1$ is trivial. So assume that the claim is true for those $S \in \mathscr{C}$ having $|S| \leq n$. In order to proceed the induction, we first prepare a lemma:

Lemma 29. *Assume that there exists a surjection $\sigma : \Phi(X) \twoheadrightarrow S$ in $\pi_1\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ with $\Gamma = (X, \xi) \in \mathscr{G}$. Then there is a left congruence $E \subseteq \mathrm{End}(X) \times \mathrm{End}(X)$ such that $S \simeq \Phi(X/E)$.*

Proof. Define $E := \{(h, k) \in \mathrm{End}(X) \times \mathrm{End}(X) \mid h_*\sigma = k_*\sigma\}$. Then E is clearly a left congruence on $\mathrm{End}(X)$. Consider a universal quotient $p : X \twoheadrightarrow X/E$ in $\mathscr{C}$. By the universality of p_*, there exists $\bar{\sigma} : \Phi(X/E) \to S$ such that the following diagram commutes:

(28)



We construct an inverse of $\bar{\sigma} : \Phi(X/E) \to S$. For this aim, notice that $\Phi(X/E)$ is equal to the quotient $\Phi(X)/\equiv$, where the equivalence relation $\equiv$ on $\mathrm{F}(X)$ is the smallest π_1-equivalence among those containing the following subset of $\mathrm{F}(X) \times \mathrm{F}(X)$:

$$\big\{(\xi_1, \xi_2) \mid \exists (h, k) \in E.\, \exists \zeta \in \mathrm{F}(X).\, \xi_1 = \zeta h_* \wedge \xi_2 = \zeta k_*\big\}. \tag{29}$$

Since $\sigma : \Phi(X) \twoheadrightarrow S$ is surjective, every $s \in S$ can be represented as $s = \xi'\sigma$ for some $\xi' \in \mathrm{F}(X)$. We now see that the assignment $S \ni \xi'\sigma \mapsto \xi' p_* \in \Phi(X/E)$ is well-defined. Since this assignment is, if well-defined, an inverse of $\bar{\sigma}$ in $\pi_1\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$, it concludes the proof of this lemma.

Let $s \in S$ be represented in two ways as $s = \xi_1\sigma = \xi_2\sigma$ with $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathrm{F}(X)$. Then, we need to show that $\xi_1 p_* = \xi_2 p_*$. By the assumption that $\Gamma = (X, \xi)$ is a galois object, there

exist $h, k \in \mathrm{End}(X)$ such that $\xi_1 = \xi h_*$ and $\xi_2 = \xi k_*$. Thus, from $\xi_1\sigma = s = \xi_2\sigma$, we obtain $\xi h_*\sigma = \xi k_*\sigma$. Since (X, ξ) is a galois object, every $\xi' \in \mathrm{F}(X)$ can be represented as $\xi' = \phi_X(\xi)$ for some $\phi \in \pi_1$. Therefore, for every $\xi' \in \mathrm{F}(X)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi' h_*\sigma &= \phi_X(\xi) h_*\sigma \\ &= \phi \cdot (\xi h_*\sigma) \quad (\because h_*, \sigma \text{ are } \pi_1\text{-equivariant}) \\ &= \phi \cdot (\xi k_*\sigma) \\ &= \phi_X(\xi) k_*\sigma \quad (\because k_*, \sigma \text{ are } \pi_1\text{-equivariant}) \\ &= \xi' k_*\sigma \end{aligned}$$

This implies $h_*\sigma = k_*\sigma$, i.e. $(h, k) \in E$. So, the pair $(\xi_1, \xi_2) = (\xi h_*, \xi k_*)$ belongs to the set (29). This proves that $\xi_1 p_* = \xi_2 p_*$ in $\Phi(X/E)$ and thus the assignment $S \in \xi'\sigma \mapsto \xi' p_* \in \Phi(X/E)$ is well-defined. This establishes an isomorphism $S \simeq \Phi(X/E)$. □

To continue the induction, let $S \in \pi_1\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ be such that $|S| = n+1$. The proof is divided into two cases.

Case 1. $S = \pi_1 \cdot a$ for some $a \in S$.

By the above lemma, it suffices to show that there exists a surjection $\Phi(X) \twoheadrightarrow S$ with $\Gamma = (X, \xi) \in \mathscr{G}$. Since $\kappa : \pi_1 \ni \phi \mapsto \phi \cdot a \in S$ is a continuous surjection onto a finite set S and $\pi_1 \simeq \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$, there exist a galois object $\Gamma = (X, \xi) \in \mathscr{G}$ and a surjection $\lambda : \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \to S$ such that the following commutes:

(30)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi_1 \simeq \lim_\Gamma \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) & \xrightarrow{\kappa} & S \\ {\scriptstyle r}\downarrow & \nearrow_{\lambda} & \\ \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) & & \end{array}$$

Combining with the bijection $\omega_{X,\xi} : \mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \ni h \mapsto \xi h_* \in \mathrm{F}(X)$, we obtain a surjective map $\omega_{X,\xi}^{-1}\lambda = \sigma : \mathrm{F}(X) \twoheadrightarrow S$. We show that σ is in fact a π_1-equivariant map, i.e. a surjection in $\pi_1\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$. Recall that, since (X, ξ) is a galois object, every $\xi' \in \mathrm{F}(X)$ can be represented as $\xi' = \phi_X(\xi)$ for some $\phi \in \pi_1$. Also notice that, by the construction, the map $\sigma : \mathrm{F}(X) \twoheadrightarrow S$ assigns to each $\xi' = \phi_X(\xi)$ the element $\phi \cdot a \in S$. Thus, for every $\psi \in \pi_1$ and $\xi' = \phi_X(\xi) \in \mathrm{F}(X)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi \cdot (\xi'\sigma) &= \psi \cdot (\phi \cdot a) \\ &= (\psi \circ \phi) \cdot a \\ &= (\psi_X \circ \phi_X(\xi))\sigma \\ &= (\psi \cdot \xi')\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that the map $\sigma : \mathrm{F}(X) \twoheadrightarrow S$ gives a surjection from $\Phi(X)$ to S in $\pi_1\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ as requested.

Case 2. $S \neq \pi_1 \cdot a$ for any $a \in S$.

In this case, there exist subobjects S_1, S_2 of S such that $|S_i| < |S|$ $(i = 1, 2)$ and $\{S_1 \hookrightarrow S, S_2 \hookrightarrow S\}$ is a covering of S. By induction hypothesis, there exist $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathscr{C}$ such that

$\Phi(Y_i) \simeq S_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$. Consider the following pullback diagram taken in π_1-**Sets**$_\omega$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S_1 \cap S_2 & \longrightarrow & S_1 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ S_2 & \longrightarrow & S \end{array} \tag{31}$$

Since $|S_1 \cap S_2| < |S|$, there also exists $Z \in \mathscr{C}$ such that $\Phi(Z) \simeq S_1 \cap S_2$. By taking a pushout diagram of $Z \hookrightarrow Y_1$ and $Z \hookrightarrow Y_2$ in $\mathscr{C}$, we have diagrams in $\mathscr{C}$ and in π_1-**Sets**$_\omega$ as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z & \longrightarrow & Y_1 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y_2 & \longrightarrow & Y \end{array} \qquad\qquad \begin{array}{ccc} S_1 \cap S_2 & \longrightarrow & S_1 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ S_2 & \longrightarrow & S \end{array} \tag{32}$$

Then, by the fact that both diagrams are pushouts and Φ preserves them, it follows that $\Phi(Y) \simeq S$. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

We have proved that $\Phi : \mathscr{C} \to \pi_1$-**Sets**$_\omega$ is fully faithful and essentially surjective. Thus, Φ is an equivalence of categories. □

A.6. **The duality theorem.** Finally, we prove that the category **Prof**.**Mon** of profinite monoids and continuous homomorphisms is opposite equivalent to the category **Semi-Galois** of semi-galois categories and *exact functors* (cf. Definition 24). The results that we proved in the previous subsections (§A.4 – §A.5) are then understood as the object portions of the target duality:

$$\textbf{Prof}.\textbf{Mon} \;\simeq\; \textbf{Semi-Galois}^{\textbf{op}}. \tag{33}$$

So, the last problem for obtaining this duality is to show that the correspondences on objects, i.e. $M \mapsto \langle M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M \rangle$ and $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle \mapsto \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$, extend to functors **Prof**.**Mon** $\to$ **Semi-Galois**$^{\textbf{op}}$ and **Semi-Galois**$^{\textbf{op}}$ $\to$ **Prof**.**Mon**; and prove that these are mutually inverse.

To proceed with the proof, we first need to define arrows in **Semi-Galois**, i.e. arrows between semi-galois categories. Briefly speaking, they are defined as suitable isomorphism classes of functors between semi-galois categories that preserve fiber functors and finite limits and colimits, which we will call *exact functors*. To be more precise, exact functors are functors that preserve fiber functors up to natural isomorphism, and formally, defined as follows:

Definition 24 (exact functor)**.** Let $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ and $\langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}' \rangle$ be semi-galois categories. A *exact functor* is a pair $\langle A, \sigma \rangle$ of a functor $A : \mathscr{C} \to \mathscr{C}'$ and a natural isomorphism $\sigma : F' \circ A \Rightarrow F$ such that A preserves finite limits and colimits.

The composition of composable exact functors $\langle A, \sigma \rangle : \langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle \to \langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}' \rangle$ and $\langle A', \sigma' \rangle : \langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}' \rangle \to \langle \mathscr{C}'', \mathrm{F}'' \rangle$ is given by $\langle A' \circ A, \sigma'' \rangle : \langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle \to \langle \mathscr{C}'', \mathrm{F}'' \rangle$, where the natural isomorphism $\sigma'' : F'' \circ (A' \circ A) \Rightarrow F$ is defined by:

$$\sigma'' : F'' \circ A' \circ A \overset{\sigma' A}{\Longrightarrow} F' \circ A \overset{\sigma}{\Longrightarrow} F. \tag{34}$$

It is straightforward to show that the composition of exact functors is indeed associative. Also, the pair of identities $\langle \mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{C}}, \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{F}} \rangle : \langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle \to \langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ is obviously an exact functor that is unit with respect to the above composition of exact functors. However, to define **Semi-Galois** so that it is opposite equivalent to **Prof**.**Mon**, we need to identify exact functors $\langle A, \sigma \rangle$ with respect to a suitable equivalence relation.

For this aim, let $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ and $\langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}' \rangle$ be semi-galois categories, and $\langle A, \sigma \rangle$ and $\langle B, \tau \rangle : \langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle \to \langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}' \rangle$ be parallel exact functors. We say that $\langle A, \sigma \rangle$ and $\langle B, \tau \rangle$ are *equivalent* and write $\langle A, \sigma \rangle \equiv \langle B, \tau \rangle$ if there exists a natural isomorphism $\lambda : A \Rightarrow B$ such that $\tau \circ F'\lambda = \sigma$. It is not difficult to see that this equivalence $\equiv$ is a category congruence (i.e. preserved by compositions); and thus, we can define a category **Semi-Galois** as follows:

Definition 25 (The category of semi-galois categories)**.** The category **Semi-Galois** is defined as the category whose objects are semi-galois categories $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ and whose arrows are equivalence classes of exact functors $\langle A, \sigma \rangle$ with respect to the above equivalence relation $\equiv$. Denoting the equivalence class of $\langle A, \sigma \rangle$ by $[A, \sigma]$, the composition of $[A, \sigma] : \langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle \to \langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}' \rangle$ and $[A', \sigma'] : \langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}' \rangle \to \langle \mathscr{C}'', \mathrm{F}'' \rangle$ is defined by $[A' \circ A, \sigma'']$, where σ'' is the one given in (34).

The rest of this subsection is devoted to a proof of the fact that **Semi-Galois** and **Prof**.**Mon** are opposite equivalent to each other via the constructions $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle \mapsto \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ of fundamental monoids; and $M \mapsto \langle M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M \rangle$ of the category of finite M-sets. Formally:

Theorem 10 (The duality theorem)**.** *There are equivalences of categories,* $\pi_1 : \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon}$ *and* $\mathscr{R} : \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$ *such that*

(1) π_1 *assigns the fundamental monoid* $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ *to each semi-galois category* $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle \in$ **Semi-Galois***;*
(2) $\mathscr{R}$ *assigns the semi-galois category* $\langle M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M \rangle$ *to each profinite monoid* $M \in$ **Prof**.**Mon***;*

and also, π_1 *and* $\mathscr{R}$ *are mutually inverse up to natural isomorphisms.*

We firstly define the functor $\pi_1 : \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}} \to \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon}$; secondly the functor $\mathscr{R} : \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon} \to \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$; and finally, prove that they are mutually inverse.

Definition 26. Let $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$ and $\langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}' \rangle$ be semi-galois categories and $\langle A, \sigma \rangle : \langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle \to \langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}' \rangle$ be an exact functor. Then, a map $\pi_1(A, \sigma) : \pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}') \to \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ between their fundamental monoids is defined as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}') & \xrightarrow{\pi_1(A,\sigma)} & \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}) \\ \phi & \longmapsto & \sigma \circ \phi A \circ \sigma^{-1} \end{array}$$

Lemma 30. *The map* $\pi_1(A, \sigma) : \pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}') \to \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$ *is a continuous homomorphism of profinite monoids, i.e. defines an arrow in* **Prof**.**Mon**.

Proof. It is easy to see that $\pi_1(A,\sigma)$ is continuous and preserves the monoid unit. To show the rest of the claim, let $\phi,\psi \in \pi_1(\mathscr{C}',\mathrm{F}')$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_1(A,\sigma)(\phi\circ\psi) &= \sigma\circ(\phi\circ\psi)A\circ\sigma^{-1}\\ &= \sigma\circ\phi A\circ\psi A\circ\sigma^{-1}\\ &= (\sigma\circ\phi A\circ\sigma^{-1})\circ(\sigma\circ\psi A\circ\sigma^{-1})\\ &= \pi_1(A,\sigma)(\phi)\circ\pi_1(A,\sigma)(\psi).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\pi_1(A,\sigma)$ is a continuous homomorphism. □

Lemma 31. *The equivalence $\langle A,\sigma\rangle \equiv \langle B,\tau\rangle$ implies $\pi_1(A,\sigma)=\pi_1(B,\tau)$. In other words, the assignment $[A,\sigma]\mapsto\pi_1(A,\sigma)$ is well-defined.*

Proof. By definition of the equivalence $\langle A,\sigma\rangle\equiv\langle B,\tau\rangle$, there exists a natural isomorphism $\lambda : A \Rightarrow B$ such that $\tau\circ\mathrm{F}'\lambda=\sigma$. Then, for $\phi\in\pi_1(\mathscr{C}',\mathrm{F}')$:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_1(A,\sigma)(\phi) &= \sigma\circ\phi A\circ\sigma^{-1}\\ &= \tau\circ\mathrm{F}'\lambda\circ\phi A\circ(\mathrm{F}'\lambda)^{-1}\circ\tau^{-1}\\ &= \tau\circ\phi B\circ\tau^{-1} \quad (\because \text{the naturality of } \phi)\\ &= \pi_1(B,\tau)(\phi)\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\pi_1(A,\sigma)=\pi_1(B,\tau)$. □

Lemma 32. *The assignment $[A,\sigma]\mapsto\pi_1(A,\sigma)$ preserves the identities and the composition of exact functors.*

Proof. The first claim is obvious. To see the second, let $[A,\sigma]:\langle\mathscr{C},\mathrm{F}\rangle\to\langle\mathscr{C}',\mathrm{F}'\rangle$ and $[A',\sigma']:\langle\mathscr{C}',\mathrm{F}'\rangle\to\langle\mathscr{C}'',\mathrm{F}''\rangle$ be composable arrows in **Semi-Galois**. Their composition is given by $[A'\circ A,\sigma\circ(\sigma' A')]$. Then, for every $\phi\in\pi_1(\mathscr{C}',\mathrm{F}')$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\pi_1(A'\circ A,\sigma\circ(\sigma' A'))(\phi)\\ =\ &\sigma\circ(\sigma' A')\circ\phi(A'\circ A)\circ(\sigma' A')^{-1}\circ\sigma^{-1}\\ =\ &\sigma\circ(\sigma'\circ\phi A'\circ\sigma'^{-1})A\circ\sigma^{-1}\\ =\ &\pi_1(A,\sigma)(\sigma'\circ\phi A'\circ\sigma^{-1})\\ =\ &\pi_1(A,\sigma)\circ\pi_1(A',\sigma')(\phi)\end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 27. The functor $\pi_1 : \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}\to\mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon}$ is defined as the assignments $\langle\mathscr{C},\mathrm{F}\rangle\mapsto\pi_1(\mathscr{C},\mathrm{F})$ on objects; and $[A,\sigma]\mapsto\pi_1(A,\sigma)$ on arrows.

To give its inverse, we define a functor $\mathscr{R} : \mathbf{Prof}.\mathbf{Mon}\to\mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$. For this aim, let M,M' be profinite monoids and $f : M\to M'$ be a continuous homomorphism. We need define an arrow $\mathscr{R}(f):\langle M'\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega,\mathrm{F}_{M'}\rangle\to\langle M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega,\mathrm{F}_M\rangle$ of semi-galois categories.

For each finite M'-set $\langle S,\rho\rangle\in M'\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$, canonically induced by f is a finite M-set $\langle S,f^*\rho\rangle\in M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$, where $f^*\rho : M\to\mathrm{End}(S)$ is the composition:

$$M\xrightarrow{f}M'\xrightarrow{\rho}\mathrm{End}(S). \tag{35}$$

Also, if $h : \langle S, \rho\rangle \to \langle T, \tau\rangle$ is an arrow in M'-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$, i.e. an M'-equivariant map, the map $h : S \to T$ obviously preserves M-actions on S and T given by $f^*\rho$ and $f^*\tau$ respectively. That is, the map h is an M-equivariant map from $\langle S, f^*\rho\rangle$ to $\langle T, f^*\tau\rangle$. Moreover, it is obvious that the assignments $\langle S, \rho\rangle \mapsto \langle S, f^*\rho\rangle$ and $h \mapsto h$ define a functor M'-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega \to M$-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$, which we denote by $\mathrm{R}(f)$.

Lemma 33. *The functor* $\mathrm{R}(f) : M'$-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega \to M$-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ *preserves finite limits and finite colimits, and also, strictly preserves fiber functors: i.e.* $\mathrm{F}_M \circ \mathrm{R}(f) = \mathrm{F}_{M'}$.

Proof. This is obvious from the definition of $\mathrm{R}(f)$ and the construction of finite limits and finite colimits in M-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$. □

Thus, the pair $\langle \mathrm{R}(f), \mathrm{id}_{F_M}\rangle$ defines an exact functor from $\langle M'$-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_{M'}\rangle$ to $\langle M$-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M\rangle$; and therefore, represents an arrow $\mathscr{R}(f) := [\mathrm{R}(f), \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{F}_M}]$ of semi-galois categories. Since the functor $\mathrm{R}(f)$ is defined by the composition (35), it also follows that we have the strict identity $\mathrm{R}(g \circ f) = \mathrm{R}(f) \circ \mathrm{R}(g)$ of functors, where $f : M \to M'$ and $g : M' \to M''$ are composable continuous homomorphisms. Finally, $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{id}_M) = \mathrm{id}_{M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega}$.

Definition 28. The functor $\mathscr{R} : \mathbf{Prof.Mon} \to \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$ is defined by the assigments $M \mapsto \langle M$-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M\rangle$ on objects; and $f \mapsto \mathscr{R}(f)$ on arrows.

Now, we have two functors, i.e. $\pi_1 : \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}} \to \mathbf{Prof.Mon}$ and $\mathscr{R} : \mathbf{Prof.Mon} \to \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}}$. In the rest of this subsection, we check that these functors are mutually inverse:

Proposition 15. $\pi_1 \circ \mathscr{R} \simeq \mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{Prof.Mon}}$.

Proof. Recall the proof of Theorem 8, where we constructed an isomorphism $M \xrightarrow{\lambda_M} \pi_1(M$-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M)$ of profinite monoids. So, in order to prove the claim, it is sufficient to show that the following diagram commutes for every continuous homomorphism $f : M \to M'$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{\lambda_M} & \pi_1(M\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_M) \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_1(\mathrm{R}(f), \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{F}_M})} \\ M' & \xrightarrow[\lambda_{M'}]{} & \pi_1(M'\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_{M'}) \end{array} \tag{36}$$

For simplicity, put $\theta := \pi_1(\mathrm{R}(f), \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{F}_M})$ throughout this proof. Let $m \in M$ and take $Y := \langle S, \rho\rangle \in M'$-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega$ arbitrarily. Then, the Y-component of the natural transformation $\theta \circ \lambda_M(m) \in \pi_1(M'$-$\mathbf{Sets}_\omega, \mathrm{F}_{M'})$ is given by: for each element $a \in S = \mathrm{F}_{M'}(Y)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \big(\theta \circ \lambda_M(m)\big)_Y(a) &= \big(\lambda_M(m)\big)_{\theta(Y)}(a) \\ &= \big(f^*\rho(m)\big)(a) \\ &= f(m) \cdot a. \end{aligned}$$

By definition of $\lambda_{M'}$, this is clearly equal to $\big(\lambda_{M'} \circ f(m)\big)_Y(a)$. Thus, the diagram (36) commutes. □

Proposition 16. $\mathscr{R} \circ \pi_1 \simeq \mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}}$.

Proof. For this proof, recall Theorem 9, where we have constructed a canonical functor $\Phi : \mathscr{C} \to \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$-**Sets**$_\omega$ that was shown to be an equivalence of categories for every semi-galois category $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle$. Moreover, Φ strictly preserves fiber functors, i.e. $\mathrm{F}_{\pi_1(\mathscr{C},\mathrm{F})} \circ \Phi = \mathrm{F}$. This means that $\langle \Phi, \mathrm{id}_\mathrm{F} \rangle$ represents an arrow $[\Phi, \mathrm{id}_\mathrm{F}]$ of semi-galois categories. In the current proof, we denote Φ by $\Phi_{\mathscr{C},\mathrm{F}}$ when indicating the domain.

Let $\langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle, \langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}' \rangle$ be semi-galois categories; and $[A, \sigma] : \langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle \to \langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}' \rangle$ be an arbitrary arrow between them. To prove the claim, it is sufficient to show that the following diagram commutes in **Semi-Galois**:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \langle \mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F} \rangle & \xrightarrow{[\Phi_{\mathscr{C},\mathrm{F}}, \mathrm{id}_\mathrm{F}]} & \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega \\ {\scriptstyle [A,\sigma]}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathscr{R}(\pi_1(A,\sigma))} \\ \langle \mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}' \rangle & \xrightarrow[[\Phi_{\mathscr{C}',\mathrm{F}'}, \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{F}'}]]{} & \pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}')\text{-}\mathbf{Sets}_\omega \end{array} \tag{37}$$

In more elementary words, this is equivalent to showing the following equivalence of exact functors:

$$\langle \Phi_{\mathscr{C}',\mathrm{F}'} \circ A, \sigma \rangle \quad \equiv \quad \langle \mathrm{R}(\pi_1(A, \sigma)) \circ \Phi_{\mathscr{C},\mathrm{F}}, \mathrm{id}_\mathrm{F} \rangle. \tag{38}$$

We now see that the natural isomorphism $\sigma : \mathrm{F}' \circ A \Rightarrow \mathrm{F}$ itself plays the role of proving this equivalence.

To save the notation, let us write $\mathrm{R} := \mathrm{R}(\pi_1(A, \sigma))$, $\Phi := \Phi_{\mathscr{C},\mathrm{F}}$ and $\Phi' := \Phi_{\mathscr{C}',\mathrm{F}'}$. Also, for each $\langle S, \rho \rangle \in \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F})$-**Sets**$_\omega$, we denote the induced finite $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}')$-set $\mathrm{R}(\langle S, \rho \rangle) = \langle S, \pi_1(A, \sigma)^* \rho \rangle \in \pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}')$-**Sets**$_\omega$ simply by $\langle S, \mathrm{R}(\rho) \rangle$. Then, to prove the equivalence (38), we need to construct a natural isomorphism $\lambda : \Phi' \circ A \Rightarrow \mathrm{R} \circ \Phi$ such that:

$$\mathrm{id}_\mathrm{F} \circ \mathrm{F}_{\pi_1(\mathscr{C}',\mathrm{F}')} \lambda = \sigma. \tag{39}$$

Notice that the requested natural isomorphism λ should consist of isomorphisms $\lambda_Y : \langle \mathrm{F}'(A(Y)), \rho_{A(Y)} \rangle \to \langle \mathrm{F}(Y), \mathrm{R}(\rho_Y) \rangle$ $(Y \in \mathscr{C})$ of finite $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}')$-sets. That is, each map $\lambda_Y : \mathrm{F}'(A(Y)) \to \mathrm{F}(Y))$ is an isomorphism that preserves $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}')$-actions. On the other hand, the requested identity (39) says that this map λ_Y must be equal to $\sigma_Y : \mathrm{F}'(A(Y)) \to \mathrm{F}(Y)$— in other words, finding a natural isomorphism $\lambda : \Phi' \circ A \Rightarrow \mathrm{R} \circ \Phi$ so that it satisfies (39) is equivalent to proving that $\sigma_Y : \mathrm{F}'(A(Y)) \to \mathrm{F}(Y)$ is not just an isomorphism, but also preserves $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}')$-actions on $\mathrm{F}'(A(Y))$ and $\mathrm{F}(Y)$ given by $\rho_{A(Y)}$ and $\mathrm{R}(\rho_Y)$ respectively.

To prove this, we recall the definitions of $\rho_{A(Y)}$ and $\mathrm{R}(\rho_Y)$. On the one hand, $\rho_{A(Y)}$ is the following monoid homomorphism, which defines a $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}')$-action on the finite set $\mathrm{F}'(A(Y))$:

$$\rho_{A(Y)} : \pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}') \ni \phi \mapsto \phi_{A(Y)} \in \mathrm{End}\big(\mathrm{F}'(A(Y))\big). \tag{40}$$

That is, for each $\phi \in \pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}')$ and $\eta \in \mathrm{F}'(A(Y))$, the action $\phi \cdot \eta \in \mathrm{F}'(A(Y))$ of ϕ on η is $\phi \cdot \eta := \phi_{A(Y)}(\eta)$. On the other hand, as mentioned above, $\mathrm{R}(\rho_Y)$ is defined as a monoid homomorphism $\pi_1(A, \sigma)^* \rho_Y$. That is:

$$\mathrm{R}(\rho_Y) : \pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}') \xrightarrow{\pi_1(A,\sigma)} \pi_1(\mathscr{C}, \mathrm{F}) \xrightarrow{\rho_Y} \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{F}(Y)), \tag{41}$$

which maps each $\phi \in \pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}')$ to $\rho_Y\big(\pi_1(A,\sigma)(\phi)\big) = \big(\sigma \circ \phi A \circ \sigma^{-1}\big)_Y$. Combining with (40), we have the following commutative diagram for each $\phi \in \pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}')$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{F}'(A(Y)) & \xrightarrow{\sigma_Y} & \mathrm{F}(Y) \\ {\scriptstyle \rho_{A(Y)}(\phi)}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{R}(\rho_Y)(\phi)} \\ \mathrm{F}'(A(Y)) & \xrightarrow[\sigma_Y]{} & \mathrm{F}(Y) \end{array} \tag{42}$$

This proves that, as requested, the map $\sigma_Y : \mathrm{F}'(A(Y)) \to \mathrm{F}(Y)$ indeed preserves $\pi_1(\mathscr{C}', \mathrm{F}')$-actions on $\mathrm{F}'(A(Y))$ and $\mathrm{F}(Y)$ given by $\rho_{A(Y)}$ and $\mathrm{R}(\rho_Y)$ respectively. This completes the proof. □

By these natural isomorphisms, $\pi_1 \circ \mathscr{R} \simeq \mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{Prof.Mon}}$ and $\mathscr{R} \circ \pi_1 \simeq \mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}}$, we obtained the requested duality:

$$\pi_1 : \mathbf{Semi\text{-}Galois}^{\mathbf{op}} \leftrightarrows \mathbf{Prof.Mon} : \mathscr{R} \tag{43}$$

Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8317, Japan

E-mail address: uramoto@kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp